

So copious however was the Roman tongue, that every degree of consanguinity and alliance by marriage, both in the transverse and direct line, might have been discriminated by a proper and separate word. Yet even their best historians are not exempt from inaccurate notations of relationship. One example shall suffice.

The two Tarquins.

“TRADITION and history said, that Superbus was the son of Priscus ;—that Superbus fought on horseback at the battle of Regillus ; that Collatinus, the husband of Lucretia, was the son of Egerius, nephew of the elder Tarquin. No, says Dionysius, none of these things can be true ; for they are not consistent with the long reigns of the kings. He produces no authority against the facts ; nor does he know who was the father of Superbus, or the father of Collatinus. But he reasons from the received chronology, and concludes, contrary to all historical testimony, that Superbus was not the son but the grandson of Priscus ;—that he did not fight on horseback at the above-mentioned battle ; and that Collatinus was not the son, but the grandson of Egerius.”

“LIVY, on the other hand, though he durst not openly contradict the received chronology, seems to have been fully persuaded that it was not so well vouched as many historical facts, with which it was incompatible. He therefore adheres to the facts, and leaves it to such notable critics as Dionysius to re-

concile them with the chronology as well as they can *."

HERE now is a *dignus vindice nodus*; a knotty point brought to the tribunal of criticism for decision. Be it in general observed, that Hooke grossly misrepresents Livy, who with his usual hesitation in matters of very remote antiquity, expresses his uncertainty whether L. Tarquin were the son or grandson of Priscus, without signifying either approbation or censure of the popular chronology †: nor does this author combat the more decisive opinion of Dionysius in the spirit of impartial arbitration, but rather with the violence and skill of an expert gladiator.

FOR his determination Dionysius assigns very apposite reasons, which seem to be founded on the report of authentic history, then but not now extant; and his ultimate inference is deduced with every criterion of conscious sincerity and truth.

THIS Analysis has exceeded its ideal boundaries. Dionysius points the whole of his artillery against Fabius Pictor, whose Roman History is long since lost. The arguments of his opponent (Dionysius) must therefore be compressed into the least prolix form of abbrevi-

* Hooke's Rom. Hist. octavo, Pref. p. 61. Here is no reference to the passages of the authors whose testimony is detailed. Consult Dion. Halicarnass. book iv. ch. vi. vol. ii. p. 153, in Spelman's Translation; and T. Livius, lib. i. cap. 46.

† Prisci Tarquinii regis filius neposne fuerit, parum liquet; pluribus tamen auctoribus filium ediderim, loc. cit.

viation. The introductory sentence it is, however, proper to transcribe at large.

“ I HAVE suspended the narration of what follows that I may give the reasons which induced me to disagree with Fabius, and the rest of the historians, who affirm, that the infants Tarquinius (Priscus) left were the sons and not the grandsons of that prince ; for those writers have very inconsiderately and negligently published this account, without examining any of the impossibilities and absurdities which destroy its truth ; every one of which I shall endeavour to point out in a few words.”

THIS author's work, no less valuable as a treasury of Roman antiquities than as a regular history from Romulus to the 312th Varronian year, may in this case be admitted to have the authority of a genuine record. It testifies that Priscus, with his wife and family, came to Rome, according to Gellius, in the first, or according to Licinnius in the eighth, of Ancus Marcius, whose reign was 24 years ;—that his age, at the latter term, could not be under 25, and all agree that he reigned 38. He must by this reckoning have died at the age of 80 ; or by the former, 88. Suppose his wife to have been five years younger than himself, she was 75 or 83 at his death. Their three sons could not then be infants ; for suppose the youngest born in the 50th of his mother's life, he was at the least 25 at the death of his father, and the eldest (Superbus) 27. He is said to have been in the vigour of life when he slew Servius Tullius, after a reign of 44 years ; and indeed it

required vigour to drag the sovereign from his throne, carry him in his arms out of the senate, and throw him down the stairs. Superbus reigned 25 years, and $27 + 44 + 25 = 96$: at which advanced age he was expelled. But still, as the report goes, his activity was unabated ; for the same year he presided in the war against the Ardeates, and during 14 years more conducted in person a long train of military operations against the new republic. Thus, according to the historians, whose authority this writer rejects, Superbus lived above 110 years. On the whole, Dionysius agrees with Piso Frugi, in affirming that Superbus and his brothers were not the sons, but the grandsons of Priscus. This conclusion divests of credibility the opinion to which Livy inclines, but does not, in plain terms, assert. In one respect however the two accounts are consistent : for if Collatinus were a nephew, Superbus might be a grandson, of the first Tarquin.

Examination of Mr. Hooke's Hypothesis.

As a strenuous advocate for Sir I. Newton's opinion, concerning the duration of the regal state in Rome, he delivers that opinion in detached parts, and in the respectable author's own words. Suspecting that Sir Isaac's arguments were not sufficient to make a general impulse on the public, and induce full conviction, he suggests a variety of auxiliary proofs. But if his author's arrangements shall be found equivocal, elusory, or incongruous with his own fundamental principles, they

they must be set aside, as indefensible. These principles are thus concisely stated.

“ THE 14 kings of the Latines, at 22 years apiece one with another, amount unto 280 years, and these years, counted from the taking of Troy, end in the 38th olympiad*.” Thus are 432 years reduced to 280: “and the seven reigns of the kings of Rome, four or five of them being slain, and one deposed, may, at a moderate reckoning, amount to 15 or 16 years apiece one with another; let them be reckoned at 17 apiece, and they will amount to about 119 years; which being counted backwards from the Regifuge, end also in the 38th olympiad: and by these two reckonings Rome was built in the 38th olympiad, or thereabout.” Historians assign to the seven kings a period of 244 years. The deduction from this article is 125, from the other 152, and the sum total 275.

PAINFUL it is to insinuate a disapprobation of the venerable Sir Isaac Newton’s postulates and conclusions; much more to pronounce them equivocal and fallacious; but it is unavoidable.

THE 14 kings of the Latins belong to the fabulous times, prior to the era of a correct chronology, and of authentic history. The duration of their reigns, either separately or collectively, is certainly amplified, as usually was done. But on perusing four different copies of these reigns, by Ovid, Virgil, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Livy, not to mention others in different re-

* Hooke’s Preface, p. 26.

cords, the writer of this Analysis ventures to affirm, that the names, number, order of succession, and years of sovereignty, are in no two registers the same. As, therefore, neither the number of princes, nor the quantity of their distinct governments, can with certainty be defined, an equation is impracticable. But if the precise interval from Latinus to Romulus, that is, from the fall of Troy to the rise of Rome, can be ascertained, let that number of years, whatever it be, fill up the blank, and from this quantity, as better known, the intermediate reigns and generations will be no impracticable discovery.

THE seven reigns from Romulus to the first pair of consuls belong to a different epoch, that of an astronomical chronology and genuine history. The names of the sovereigns are in every record the same, the order of succession the same, the length of each reign the same, and the aggregate sum the same, the space of every interreign, as oft as it happened, the same. Why then should Sir Isaac Newton, by a plausible artifice in computation, confound the historical period with the fabulous?

“SOME of the Greeks,” he observes, “called the times before the reign of Ogyges UNKNOWN, because they had no history of them; those between his flood and the beginning of the olympiads, FABULOUS, because their history was much mixed with poetical fables; and those after the beginning of the olympiads, historical, because their history was free from such fables. The fabulous ages wanted a good chronology; and

and so also did the historical for the first 60 or 70 olympiads *."

THIS is an ambiguous and consequently a questionable criterion. Seventy olympiads make 280 years. To bring the date of authentic history among the gentiles so very low, is to extend the fabulous age so far as to the fifth century nearly before the Christian era. This postulate is not to be admitted. Few histories of indubitable credibility indeed were then published; but the olympiad from its restoration, in the 34th of Uzziah king of Judah, was an infallible term of computation; and facts characterised with this era are not rashly to be pronounced fictitious or false. This is not the proper place for ample discussion. The inquisitive and learned reader is referred to Dr. Musgrave's "Examination of Sir Isaac Newton's Objections to the Chronology of the Olympiads†."

THE arrangements in "The Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended," are not only equivocal and elusive, but inconsistent with the author's own fundamental principles. For instance,

"CARTHAGE was destroyed in the consulship of Lentulus and Mummius, A. P. J. 4568." This was the Varronian year of Rome 608. A term in computation once assumed, for fixing the date of any other historical incident; ought not to be transferred to any other point of time; because the source of reckoning, if changed,

* Ancient Chronology amended, page 44.

† Lond. 1782, octavo.

misplaces the date of the incident resting on that basis. Sir Isaac Newton ascribes to Carthage an existence of 130 years prior to the foundation of Rome, in the third year of the sixth olympiad. But if that foundation be brought lower by 130 years, neither the rise nor fall of Carthage is determined. This arbitrary shifting of terms is a sort of legerdemain in chronology.

To bring discredit on the long reigns from Romulus to the second Tarquin, Sir Isaac Newton remarks, "In the latter ages since chronology hath been exact, there is scarcely an example of ten kings reigning any where in continual succession, above 260 years:" that is, 26 years the mean quantity. But Whiston, as quoted by Hooke, in his "Confutation of Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology," observes, that in England we have had NINE successive reigns, at almost 30 years apiece, from Henry I. to Edward III.

TWELVE, at almost 28 years each, from William the Conqueror to Richard II.

THE French have had six reigns together, at almost 40 years apiece, from Robert to Philip II.

EIGHT reigns, at above 35 years apiece, from Robert to Lewis IX.

TEN reigns, almost 33 years apiece, from Robert to Philip IV.

MR. Hooke is so very candid as to confess, "Now I think it must be granted, that the examples which Mr. Whiston has produced of long reigns in succession, both in England and in France, would be sufficient to make it credible, that the seven kings of Rome

reigned as long as they are reported to have done, if there were no objection to this report, but its being uncommon to find, in authentic and undisputed history, seven kings reigning in succession 35 years, one with another *.” He produces, however, four reasons of dissent, set forth with a fair shew of plausibility ; but they are nugatory.

WHEN monarchy was exchanged for the consulate, no great care was taken to preserve the memorials of arbitrary power. The palace and temple of Numa acquired veneration ; but even the very name of the Tarquine family was transmitted with marks of infamy. Much stronger was the desire of consigning the whole race to oblivion, than of perpetuating their names in the order of lineal succession. Though the people, immediately after the revolution, decreed the restoration of Tarquin’s private estates to his relations ; yet the senate destroyed his palace, and distributed his lands among the needy citizens, retaining for public use a small portion of a field only, adjoining to the *Campus Martius*, which the king had, by usurpation, added to his private property. Collatinus, that virtuous and brave patriot, finding suspicion and jealousy attached inseparably to his family and name, took the moderate expedient of retiring into private life, even before the expiration of the first consulship. The records of the old kings in Latium, and those also of the second series from Romulus, were lost in the conflagration of the

* Hooke’s Pref. p. 29.

capitol, so early as the second century of the republic. Hence the numerous complaints of imperfect and penurious materials in the Augustan age, for constructing a full and continuous history of the early times.

AFTER an equal period of time from the dissolution of the late monarchy in France, should the rage for annihilating every reliet of arbitrary government continue; should accidents and violence make alike havoc of public archives;—it may fairly be presumed, six centuries hence, that antiquaries and critics will divide into parties concerning the genealogy of the French monarchs from 1610 to 1774. In this interval of 164 years, from the murder of Henry IV. to the accession of Louis XVI. only three sovereigns occupied successively that throne, the mean proportion of as many reigns being 54 years eight months. Those numerous and bulky volumes, which now have for their subject the story of a single reign, or of one kingdom, will then shrink into little abstracts, with very concise hints of family descents and dates. Serious controversies may then be agitated, whether the uncommon length of those three reigns ought not, as incredible, to be reduced, or the intermediate generations multiplied.

THIS example seems directly applicable to the present disquisition. Sir Isaac Newton, in order to authenticate his scheme of retrenching 125 years from the regal government, prior to the republic, endeavours, by a like effort of ingenuity, to invalidate the chronology of the first 60 or 70 olympiads. If this arrangement be adopted, it will be altogether impossible to connect,
by

by infallible synchronisms, the profane history with the sacred, and to reconcile any one national era of the gentile world with another.

THE Julian period comprehends all other terms in computation, whether circulating or fixed. This, therefore, is the regulating measure and ultimate test to which not only the first, but all the subsequent years of the olympiads, of Rome, Nabonassar, the Seleucidæ, and those of the world, must be adjusted.

THE number of the Julian period 3937, coincident with A. M. 3232, and the 34th of Uzziah king of Judah, is not the first year of the first olympiad, but the exclusive source of computation. That year was bissextile, a character common to the last or fourth of every olympiad, and consequently A. P. J. 3938, and A. M. 3233, was the first of the first olympiad.

THE building of Rome was begun in the third of the sixth olympiad A. P. J. 3960, A. M. 3255, the 5th of Jotham king of Judah, and the first of Romulus, the year before the Varronian computation, first Jan. A. P. J. 3961.

IN A. P. J. 3967, A. M. 3262, the 12th of Jotham, the 7th of Romulus, the 6th Varronian year, and the second year of the 8th olympiad, began the famous era of Nabonassar, by which Ptolemy reckoned the years of the four Pagan empires.

THUS, by a multiplicity of chronological characters, is a firm basis laid for computation in the descending series indefinitely. But remove the source of the olympiads almost three centuries lower, and that of Rome

125 years, the chain of chronology is broken, connecting numbers misplaced, and historical order involved in a labyrinth of perplexity and confusion inextricable.

THAT 34th year of Uzziah was the 202d of the 390 from the apostacy of the ten tribes, and 88th before the conflagration of the temple, A. P. J. 4126, A. M. 3421, Er. Nab. 160. This conflagration was the first of the 46th olympiad, the year before the archonship of Philombrotus: the 166th Varronian year, and the 29th of Tarquinius Priscus. But by two bold anachronisms in the "Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended," is the connexion of the sacred history with that of Greece and Rome, deferred not only without necessity, but contrary to authentic evidence.

To no purpose does Mr. Hooke pretend that we have no better authority for the long reigns of the seven kings in Rome, than for the long reigns of the 14 kings of Alba, their predecessors. The reverse has been established. The very existence of many in the latter class is doubtful; whereas the existence of all the kings subsequent to Numitor, is much more fully confirmed than that of many pairs of consuls under the republic.

EQUALLY frivolous are the reasons urged for abbreviating the reigns of the sovereigns after Numitor. The history of the longest reigns, and of the most active princes, may be comprised within very narrow limits, if the records of the times were destroyed or little known, except the names of magistrates and the du-
ration

ration of their offices ; which, it is admitted, was the case in the early ages both of Greece and Rome.

ON the whole, this defender of Sir Isaac Newton is more sanguine than judicious. His primary object was to abridge the chronology of the regal state in Rome to an agreement with a retrenched and mutilated genealogy. But the historical evidence is much stronger, nay decisively certain in favour of an additional generation between Priscus and Superbus. Mr. Hooke argued fallaciously. By setting Livy and Dionysius at variance, he artfully tried to set aside the arrangement of both. But a minute examination of their testimony invalidates the postulates and conclusions of Sir Isaac Newton.

IF these remarks should be deemed rather diffuse, they exemplify the subservience of genealogy to the truth of computation, and the orderly form of history. By inserting them here the subjects of the ensuing chapters, being in part anticipated, will the more concisely be discussed.

C H A P. I.

SECOND SERIES OF XIV. GENERATIONS.

IN the ages prior to David, the spaces between descents in families have been ascertained in the order of occurrence; their application to chronology and history having been necessary only in certain emergent circumstances. Henceforth the chronologer, if he regulate his procedure with a due regard to generations, finds thorns in his way at every step. David, the last of the first series from Abraham, was born, as already noted, in the 10th of Saul, succeeded him at 30, and after a reign of 40, died, leaving his throne and honours to

1. *Solomon.*

IN the history of his life, the date of his birth is not defined; neither the time of his accession, nor the years of his life. The duration of his reign over all Israel (40 years) is twice recorded* : and hence, perhaps, all the other notations may with tolerable certainty be inferred. In the progressive series this discovery, as important, is desirable. Another biographical article,

* 1 Kings, xi. 42 and 2 Chron. ix. 30.

intimately

timately connected with the history of the times, has an immediate reference not only to his single reign, but to the ensuing generations in the lineal descents;—the date of his defection from wisdom.—All these circumstances are so inseparably implicated with the subsequent reign, that a separate disquisition would be the source of many unavoidable repetitions; to prevent which it is requisite to consider two complex subjects as one.

2. *Rehoboam.*

“HE was 41 years old at his accession *.” This notation ill accords with every circumstance by which Solomon’s age is in general terms described at the time of his father’s decease. At that crisis which brought timidity and courage to the hour and theatre of conflict, the young prince [Solomon] overpowered by an accumulation of new honours, and arduous services, which required a vigorous mind improved by the habits of mature experience, he called himself “a little child †.” This phrase is admissible as a becoming expression of humility, not as a determinate chronological character.

JOSEPHUS, depending either on a conjecture of his own, or on vague tradition, affirms that Solomon was then but a youth in age ‡; and as he expresses no number, it may be presumed that he meant a term

* 1 Kings, xiv. 21. 2 Chron. xii. 13.

† 1 Kings, iii. 7.

‡ Ant. viii. 1. 1.

under fulness of stature. Afterward he says, that this prince died a very old man, having reigned 80 and lived 94 years *. Hence it is obvious, that the great Jewish historian supposed that Solomon ascended the throne at the age of 14. But the canonical records allow but 40 years for the length of his reign; and if this quantity be deducted from his term of life, he must have died at the age of 54. Deduct 41 years for Rehoboam's age at his accession, the surplus 13, for the age of the father, is incompatible by deficiency with the usual term of procreation. In computation, a double genealogical paradox, relative to an individual, must be reprobated †. If Solomon lived 94 years, this protracted term is not classed with physical impossibilities; but is inconsistent with implicit characters in the history of Solomon. Upon his choice of wisdom, as the crown of human excellence and the best gift of essential goodness, absolute was the promise of riches and honours, together with the fullest measures of human wisdom; not so that of long life. To this secondary blessing was annexed the condition of continuance in doing well. Solomon's degeneracy was remarkable, nearly resembling the fall of Lucifer; and it is scarcely supposable that Heaven would reward his egregious defection with a length of days prolonged to a period then unusual. For many reasons reserved for their

* Ant. viii. 7. 7.

† No example of a child born before the 16th of a father's life, has it been found proper to admit in the Bible history, and in this case it may easily be avoided.

altc 2 proper place, it is expedient to ~~enlarge~~ the number of his years, both at the time of Rehoboam's birth, and that of his own death.

USHER allows 18 years for Solomon's age at his accession. This arrangement incurs no objection from the foregoing history. But the chronology of the times admits, nay the course of nature requires, that his nativity be placed a little higher, to prevent, as much as possible, embarrassment and perplexity in the sequel of the genealogical series.

THIS date depends entirely on the time when Uriah fell by the sword of the Ammonites, then at war with the armies of Israel; and the rise of that war may, with historical consistency, be supposed two years earlier than the date assigned in the Annals.

By this adjustment of events and numbers, Solomon was born in the 20th of David's reign, and the 50th of his life. The son consequently began to reign in the 20th of his own age. But here a train of perplexities sets computation at defiance. He died in the 60th of his life. Hence deduct the 41 years of Rehoboam, the residue denotes the 19th of Solomon. From the course of nature no incredible or absurd consequence ensues. But the history both of the father and the son remonstrates. With the two original texts specifying the age of the son, almost every ancient version agrees, and the few variations afford no probable solution. Though the notations of number are uniform, consent is uniformity in error. Many and forcible reasons induce the belief, that the original notes of

number have accidentally been enlarged. Of these reasons some affect the character of Solomon.

Rehoboam's Mother was an Ammonitess.

“AN Ammonite and a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even unto their 10th generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the Lord for ever.” The reason is assigned: “Because they met you not with bread and with water in the way;—and because they had hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor to curse thee *.”

THIS law was an absolute prohibition without exception of persons, or limitation of time. The *tenth generation*, and *for ever*, are interchangeable terms, as is evident from the dissolution of such marriages in the days of Nehemiah, more than 1000 years, that is, 30 generations after the passage over Jordan. This prince is on that occasion named, not without a peculiar mark of infamy. “Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? even him did outlandish women cause to sin †.”

REHOBAM, if his age be accurately defined, was one year old at the death of David, who certainly would not have approved this gross violation of a divine statute, so peremptorily forbidden. In his last charge to Solomon, the character is set forth as pure without a stain. He is exhorted not to reform, but to persevere. But this one deviation from rectitude, had it been

* Deut. xxiii. 3. 4.

† Neh. xiii. 26.

known,

known, must have incurred reprehension, or at least been marked, as an exception to that excellent character, which is expressed without abatement, “Thou art a wise man *.”

PRESUMED it may be that this illicit connexion was concealed from the aged sovereign. But that it was a connexion of a subsequent date, may reasonably be inferred from the unreserved approbation of the divine Being intimated to the young prince, first at Gibeon, and repeated after the dedication of the temple †. The result of these observations is, that Rehoboam was not born in the lifetime of David, neither before the dedication of the temple; and so was not 41 years old at the demise of Solomon. This position derives credibility from circumstances recorded in his own history. “Rehoboam having rejected the salutary advice of the *old men*, who stood before his father while he yet lived, consulted with the young men, who were grown up with him, and stood before him; and said unto them, What advice give ye? And the young men spake unto him, &c. ‡” Both the requisition and the answer favoured more of juvenile precipitation than of mature experience. All seem to have been under age, without either the understanding of men, or the simplicity of children. In that age of time men were not denominated *young*, at or after 40.

AGAIN, Abijah his son, as soon as seated on the throne, thus expostulated with Jeroboam king of Israel,

* 1 Kings, iii. 9.

† 1 Kings, iii. 5. and ix. 1.

‡ 1 Kings, xii. 6—10.

and his faction. “ Vain men, the children of Belial strengthened themselves against Rehoboam, when he, being young and tender-hearted, could not withstand them *.” If this apology insinuated inexperience or a defect of intellectual vigour, it was improper, and scarcely consistent with decorum and filial regard: if literally to be understood of premature age, the censure was apposite and pointed. This notation is more decisive than the other, and both, superadded to the former remarks, induce the opinion, that Rehoboam’s age was not 41 at the death of his father.

Time of Solomon’s Defection.

HIS connexion with strange women, and the birth of a son by an Ammonitess before the expiration of his 19th year, are, if admitted, incontrovertible proofs of early depravity. But this presumption vanishes, when it is considered that the divine approbation, subsequent to the dream and vision at Gibeon, justifies the inference, that his heart was then pure from every habit of licentiousness, and from the pride of life. “ Froward thoughts separate from God; for into a malicious soul WISDOM shall not enter, neither dwell in a body enslaved unto sin. The holy spirit of discipline will flee from deceit, and remove from thoughts without understanding †.” A sudden transition from the vigour of good principles and habits, especially if they be the acquisition of early life, to the lowest sink of sensuality,

* 2 Chron. xiii. 6. 7.

† Wisdom of Solomon, i. 3—5.

is scarcely conceivable. This sublime model of human excellence, like many inferior characters, degenerated, by slow imperceptible degrees, into folly and vice: and this immoral familiarity with the Ammonitets might have been the very first step towards apostacy. At whatever time he arrived at the last stage of his fatal career in wickedness, the birth of Rehoboam cannot be supposed prior to the dedication of the temple. Neither can its date be brought much lower. If he were 31 years old at his accession, his nativity will coincide with the 9th of his father's reign, the very year of the dedication; but this arrangement is at variance with the gracious communications and promises vouchsafed, when the Lord appeared to him the second time, as at Gibeon formerly *. On that occasion motives to stability were enforced, without the least reference to past misconduct. It must however be granted, that no time much later can, consistently with the subsequent series of genealogy, be assigned for Rehoboam's birth. If it be brought forward to the 24th of the father's reign, when he had finished the temple and his own palace; the son must have succeeded to the crown in his 16th year, which early age seems to accord with those accounts, already quoted, of his youth and tenderness of heart. But the arguments on the opposite side preponderate.

I. REHOBAM must have died in his 33d year:—
a conclusion incongruous with the few years and nu-

* 1 Kings, ix. 2—9.

merous family of his son Abijah. Afa too must have been born in the infancy of Abijah, and Jehoshaphat in the infancy of Afa ; in like manner Jehoram in the infancy of Jehoshaphat, and Ahaziah in the infancy of Jehoram. These natural reasons are insurmountable, while those of the moral kind subsist in their invariable nature and full force ; for

2. THE 24th of Solomon was that very year in which he had finished the Lord's house and his own house. The same was the date of the second appearance, like unto the first at Gibeon. In both, the testimony of the divine acceptance was absolute ; in both the stability of the kingdom was the condition of stability in obedience. No admonitions to reformation are implied, because no instances of past provocation are expressed. Yet certainly Solomon's connexion with the Ammonitess, (whether by wedlock or by concubinage, it matters not, for both were strictly forbidden), was of a prior date. Here is a horned argument, which pushes both ways, and both ways with equal force.

EXCEPT the idea above suggested, of a gradually slow progress in degeneracy, no other expedient for eluding the *whole result* of the objection occurs. As apostacy, no less than advances to perfection, has its imperceptible stages, so the distinction between immoral acts in an individual, and those which affect the functions of a public character, seems not improper. David, in his private capacity, derived an indelible stain from his conduct towards a private family. This is the sole exception to the glorious character given after his death ;

death : “ He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from any thing which the Lord commanded him all the days of his life, save *only* in the matter of Uriah *.” One honourable ingredient in his regal department is, an invariable attachment to purity of worship, and uniform opposition to all idolatrous rites. In this view David was always set forth as the pattern of Solomon’s imitation. “ If thou wilt walk in my ways, to keep my statutes and commandments, as thy father David did walk, &c. †” In the event of provocations in private conduct, personal chastisements were denounced ; but should the sovereign, or his children, turn aside and serve other gods, the kingdom was to be divided, and Israel to be cut off out of the land.

ADMIT that Solomon had begun his fatal intercourse with strange women about the time the temple was finished, or even a little before, yet was he on the verge of senility before his many wives turned away his heart after other gods ‡ : and his reign had nearly expired before the prophet was sent to announce the division of the kingdom, after his decease §. This message, with a brief account of his seeking to kill Jeroboam, concludes the history of Solomon’s life and reign.

IN some intermediate period must Rehoboam have been born, neither so early as the exit of David, nor long after the dedication of the temple ; for at his ac-

* 1 Kings, xv. 5.

‡ 1 Kings, xii. 4.

† 1 Kings, iii. 14. and ix. 4--10.

§ 1 Kings, xi. 31. 40.

cession, such a number of years must be allowed as may be sufficient to regulate the ensuing genealogies by the course of nature. For this end 27 years are fully adequate. On the highest probability, therefore, may the nativity of Rehoboam be put in connexion with the 33d year of his father's life, the 13th of his reign, the 10th from the foundation of the temple, and the very year after it was dedicated *.

EVERY judicious reader, who accurately compares all circumstances recorded in the sacred history concerning this very mixed character, will be convinced, that the observations both of Whiston and his author, are incapable of a full confirmation. For, 1. Each proceeds on the romantic hypothesis that Solomon reigned 80, and lived 94 years. 2. That Hadad began,

* This is a proper place for inserting a strange reverie of Whiston in two notes on Josephus. " Since the beginning of Solomon's evil and wicked life, and adversity, was at the time when Hadad, or Ader, who was born at least 20 or 30 years before Solomon came to the crown, in the days of David, began to give him disturbance; this implies that Solomon's evil life began early and continued very long, which the multitude of his wives and concubines does plainly imply also: I suppose when he was not 50 years of age.—The youth of Jeroboam, when Solomon built the walls of Jerusalem, not very long after he had finished his 20 years in building the temple, and his own palace, or not very long after the 24th of his reign, and his youth still here mentioned, when Solomon's wickedness was become intolerable, fully confirm my former observation, that such his wickedness began early, and continued very long."—Whiston's Josephus, Ant. viii. 7. 6—8.

to give him disturbance immediately after the death of David; whereas that disturbance is expressly referred to Solomon's old age. 3. Jeroboam is characterised as a young man in a very late period of Solomon's reign. 4. Long after Solomon's two great buildings, in the 24th year from the death of David, he shone in the full possession of wisdom, piety, patriotism, and renown. In a former sheet of this Analysis, p. 68, are the authorities collected. 5. Neither Josephus, nor his translator, distinguish as they ought, and as the sacred historian had very properly done before them, between the idolatry and other immoralities of this prince. 6. Highly probable it is, that the message denounced by the prophet, concerning the partition of the kingdom, was the first providential circumstance which led Solomon to repentance. 7. That he became a genuine penitent is naturally inferred from his experimental reflexions on the vanity and vexation arising from sensuality and the pride of life:—reflexions which would not so readily occur to a mind, inebriated with the high-fashioned elegancies of corporeal pleasure; neither could he, without excess in their use, describe them with such painful compunction; much less resolve the chief good of man into obedience and the fear of God. These are not the sentiments of a voluptuary pursuing the wild career of vicious indulgence. 8. Though 40 years be taken from his reign, yet strong are the probabilities that he did not become licentious in the extreme, till after he was 50 years old. He died in the
beginning

beginning of his 60th year, some time after Jeroboam removed into Egypt, whence his reformation has been dated. The general inference is, that his defection was neither early, nor of long continuance.

THUS is rectified an egregious mistake of numerical signatures, not by similar figures of different value, not by parallel texts, not by various readings in original copies, ancient versions, quotations, rash conjectures, &c. but by evidence much more decisive, the harmony of historical circumstances, and the uniform process of nature. Rehoboam, at the age of 27, might properly be said to have been not only the companion of young men, but young and tender-hearted.

Harmer's Criticism.

THIS very ingenious author maintains the common opinion, and hence derives inferences destructive of his own scheme. "It appears from the age of Rehoboam, that Solomon was married before his coming to the crown; whereas this affinity with Pharaoh's daughter was made some time after; and from this song [THE CANTICLES] it appears, that he not only was married, but had several wives of the highest rank, as well as many who were called concubines, at the time of those nuptials which this song celebrates, ch. vi. 8.

"THE first wife of every eastern prince is, and was wont to be considered, as the principal, and whatever addition was made to the number of their wives who had dowry, they usually preserved their prerogatives :
yet

yet it might not be impossible to remove such a one from her dignity *."

FACILITY of conjecture may be attained with little trouble, and employed to little purpose. It is here assumed that Solomon was married, and his successor born, before he came to the crown. No attempt is tried to ascertain the age of the young monarch. Whether it were 14, 18, 20, or more or less, than any of these numbers, the author regards not. It is enough to affirm, that Solomon was married, and had a son, before his affinity with the princess-royal of Egypt. All this is surmise, not evidence. It is nowhere said, that Maacah, the Ammonitess, was married to Solomon. If she were, the connection was, by the laws of the kingdom, null and void. As she was an alien, incapable of rank and preeminence, (as a matron or queen in Israel), by a particular act of exclusion, all her prerogatives could have no existence but in the fertile fancy of a poetical antiquary. By the same licence of fiction too, Rehoboam was born before his father was invested with royalty. This position seems to rest on the authority of two texts, which, brought to the test of sound criticism, are found to express erroneous numbers. The princess of Egypt was it seems not the first or principal wife of Solomon; but though she was not, the other, to whom these prerogatives belonged, might possibly be removed from her dignity. It is not as-

* Outlines of a Commentary on Solomon's Song, drawn by the aid of Instructions from the East, p. 52, 53.

serted, that Maacah, like Vashti, was dismissed with the formalities of a divorce. For the ingenious author proceeds:

“ I AM supposing that she [the first and principal queen of Solomon] was an Israelitess,” p. 65. Neither is it affirmed, that this Israelitess was degraded to make way for Pharoah’s daughter. No such thing. Mr. Harmer rather thinks “ that a prince, so remarkable for finding expedients, might reconcile jarring interests by an equal division of honours.”—Here again is a fable, but not cunningly devised. The existence of this Israelitess, and her actual espousals, also her priority of time, and preeminence in rank, ought to have been ascertained. If the prince had the peculiar address to balance with dexterity the etiquette of court honours, his skill seems to have forsaken him in this instance. For from the surface of the poem it is obvious, that jealousy and envy are the prominent qualities of the female interlocutors. Equality of honours was incompatible with the supremacy of ONE. Even the catastrophe does not reconcile *jarring interests*.

THE plan or construction of the poem plainly intimates, that Solomon, by marrying a foreign princess of Ham’s swarthy family, had given offence to the virgin daughters of Zion. She, apprehensive of discouragement from this circumstance, makes such apposite apologies, as might prevent unfavourable impressions. “ I am black, but comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, Look not upon me because I am black, because the sun hath looked upon me.” Complexion is thus properly resolved

resolved into the influence of climate. That darkness of hue was no exception to Solomon's choice, whose generous love overlooked the exterior distinctions of colour and form. This stranger-queen expresses everywhere conjugal affection in its purest ardours, and complacency in its sublimest transports. The daughters of Jerusalem, though moved with jealousy and envy, preserve the decorum suitable to connubial solemnities, yet obliquely insinuate hints disrespectful to the prince: "What is thy beloved more than another beloved, O thou fairest among women? What is thy beloved more than another beloved, that thou dost so charge us?"

THE fundamental idea of the poem seems to be, the contempt and enmity of the Jews towards the Gentiles, when the latter were received into an equal participation of privileges with the former. Long before the days of Solomon had this event been foretold in the oracles of prophecy: "I will move them to jealousy with those who are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation *." This prediction is fully verified in the four gospels, and in the acts of the apostles. The jealousy and anger of the Jews impelled them to all the wild extremes of persecution; for they considered Christ, his apostles, and the disciples of both, as blasphemers against Moses, against the temple, and against God; and all, as many of their own nation as had become profelytes to the Christian faith, they pronounced apostates. Such seems to be primary senti-

* Deut. xxxii. 21.

ment, and ultimate truth, adumbrated in this beautiful allegory.

To the establishment of this conclusion it is not necessary with Mr. Harmer to suppose, that Solomon had espoused an Israelite before Pharaoh's daughter, a conjecture which history does not authorise. The usage of polygamy is foreign to the plan of the poem. Its general subject is not properly Solomon and Christ in their distinct personalities; but the existence of the Jewish church when the princess of Egypt became their queen, and also when Christ came to extend mercy to mankind at large. The particular subject is the resentment of the Jews on both these occasions; the one being an image of the other *.

* "I would advise, that this production be treated according to the established rules in this kind of allegory, fully and expressly delivered in the sacred writings, and that the author be permitted to be his own interpreter. In this respect the errors of critics and divines have been as numerous as they have been pernicious. Not to mention other absurdities, they have taken the allegory, not as denoting the universal state of the church, but the spiritual state of individuals, than which nothing can be more inconsistent with the very nature and ground-work of the allegory itself, as well as with the general practice of the Hebrew poets on these occasions." Bishop Lowth's Lectures on S. Poetry, vol. ii. p. 331.

C H A P. II.

*Second Series of XIV. Generations continued.*3. *Abijah.*

HIS age, when he assumed the crown and sceptre in Judah, is not defined. It is therefore to be postulated according to physical probability. His father died at the age of 44, as above stated. The only remaining circumstances on which computation must proceed are, that he reigned three years, and died the father of 22 sons and 16 daughters *. For this reason the earliest period of Rehoboam's life, consistent with the age of procreation, is to be admitted as the probable date of the son's birth. In a few instances, it has been necessary to allow but 16 years for the interval of family descents, and this is one of the number. Thus Abijah's age at his accession was 28, and at his death, 31. The only foreseen objection to computation is the number of his children at so early a term of life. It is however obviated by a very seasonable remark of the

* 2 Chron. xiii. 21.

facred historian. His 38 fons and daughters were by 14 mothers.

4. *Afa.*

NEITHER is his age, at the time of his investiture with royalty, expreffed. The former rule muft again be applied. At his father's deceafe he feems to have been a minor; for it is recorded, "that he removed Maacah his mother from being queen, because ſhe had made an idol in a grove *." From the circumſtance of her making an idol in a grove, Selden conjectures that ſhe was a prieſteſs of Aſheroſh, the Aſtarte of the Phenicians, who had a magnificent temple at Hierapolis in Syria, the ſame with the Grecian Venus. That ſhe might no longer patroniſe idolatry in Judah, Afa, as ſoon as he came of age, diveſted her of the regency, after ſhe had held that dignity three years. By this computation he was born in the 18th of his father's life, ſucceeded him as a minor when 13 years old, and at the legal age of 16 commenced his perſonal reign. Joſephus ſays, that this prince, by God's bleſſing, ob-

* 2 Chron. xv. 16. Concerning her name and natural relation to Afa, different accounts are given. Maacah is the name of Abijah's mother, 1 Kings, xv. 2. where ſhe is likewiſe ſaid to have been a daughter of Abiſhalom. Joſephus agrees in both theſe designations, and adds, that ſhe was a granddaughter of Abſalom by Tamar. She was therefore the granddaughter of Abſalom, and grandmother of Afa. According to the Hebrew phraſeology, even remote deſcendants are very uſually called fons and daughters. See Dr. Wall on the text laſt quoted; and Joſephus, Ant. viii. 10. 1.

tained a long and happy life, as the reward of his piety and righteousness *. The Bible extols his many and eminent virtues; but says nothing of his long life. From the account above given of Abijah's short life and reign, it is certain that Afa's age could not exceed 54. Josephus, when not directed by notations of time in the sacred Annals, usually amplifies numbers †.

5. *Jehoshaphat.*

AT the age of 35 he began his reign of 25 years, and consequently was born in the 19th of his father Afa's life ‡.

6. *Jehoram.*

“HE was 32 years old when he began to reign, and reigned eight years in Jerusalem §.” By this notation

* Ant. viii. 12. 6.

† This author agrees in every variation concerning Maacah, with respect to the specifications already mentioned—as the wife of Rehoboam, the mother of Abijah and Afa, the daughter of Absalom. In Josephus, Ant. viii. 11. 4. Micaiah is the name of Afa's mother: and in 2 Chron. xiii. 2. Abijah's mother is so expressed, with this addition, “that she was a daughter of Uriel of Gibeah.” These variations infer no uncertainty. The difference of the name does not necessarily imply a diversity of persons. Much greater variations in orthography are consistent with the usage of diverse dialects. Uriel was most probably the husband of Absalom's daughter (Tamar), whose daughter Maacah, or Micaiah, was the mother of Abijah, and the grandmother of Afa, in whose minority she was queen regent, and deposed when he came of age.

‡ 2 Chron. xxx. 31.

§ 2 Chron. xxi. 5.

R

his

his age at death did not exceed 40. Hence result several difficulties in computation, not to be obviated otherwise, than by taking the chronological characters of this reign, in connection with those of the ensuing.

“JEHORAM had several sons (their number not specified); and a band of Arabians, Ethiopians, and Philistines, came up against Judah, and carried away all the substance found in the king's house, and his sons also, and his wives, so that never a son was left him, save Jehoahaz, [Ahaziah], the youngest of his sons:—him the inhabitants of Jerusalem made king in his (father's) stead; for the band of men, that came up with the Arabians to the camp, had slain all the rest. Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign. He reigned eight years in Jerusalem, and his mother's name was Athalia, the daughter [of Ahab and grand-daughter] of Omri *.” The notation for Ahaziah's age, 42, is happily corrected into 22†. Dr. Wall in his note on the place, not without reason, pronounces this larger number one of the most palpable mistakes, and wrong readings in the Hebrew text of this book (2 Chronicles). “Few,” he says, “of the rest are corrected in the Greek version, but this is.” Kennicott assigns the most probable source of the mistake. For מנ 42, כב 22, had inadvertently been substituted. This sets the matter right at once. The true number he observes is read universally in all the translations, as well as in the original of Kings; in the

* 2 Chron. xxi. 6. and ch. xxii. 3.

† 2 Kings, viii. 26.

Syriac and Arabic versions of the Chronicles; and in the valuable printed edition of the Septuagint by Aldus, in 1518. He might have added the excellent impression at Frankfurt, fol. 1697.

THAT singular criterion, which gives a son the rank of seniority to a father;—a seniority of two years, and recorded in an ancient history;—has every reason to be considered as a writ of error, and the title thence accruing as a counterfeit. The scribes, from ignorance, make a false report. The historian's notations accord with nature. For a father, dying at 40, might leave a son 22 years old. This youngest son, however, had elder brothers; and, to the conviction of all impartial judges, it may be certified that the age of Jehoram was 32; when he began his joint reign, and 36 at his father's death. His age was consequently 44, Ahaziah being born in his 22d year, and his elder sons, by several mothers, between the 16th and 22d. As in genealogy the Archbishop's knowledge is superficial, so his decisions are incongruous often with his premises. Yet even he saw the propriety of admitting, that the 32d of Jehoram's age ought to be reckoned from his advancement to the throne in his father's life-time.

THIS Ahaziah, having reigned one year together with his father, which as complete makes the 8th and last of his administration; and one full year more after his decease, was, in the 24th of his own life, cut off by the sword of Jehu. As the seventh in succession from David exclusively, he ought, on the authority of the royal calendar in Judah, to be included in this series.

But he is omitted in the list of Christ's ancestors by the evangelist Matthew ; and as not now extant in this division, he is here in like manner left out, though, for reasons to be mentioned, it may be requisite to replace him with others ; both to fill up the triple series, and to reconcile the Old and New Testament registers.

HIS mother Athalia, having slain all the seed royal in Judah, except the infant Joash, invaded the throne, and fell, after an usurpation of six years, a victim to the resentments of the princes and people of the land, and to the justice of an avenging Providence.

7. *Jehoash, or Joash.*

ON the express authority of notations in the sacred records, has his claim to the throne been evinced. Were his lineage, as an immediate son of Ahaziah, less certain, the descent of Jesus Christ from David would be more doubtful. But the direct evidences of this fact, produced in the foregoing pages, shew, that idle conjectures and chimerical notions merit no regard. This infant, (rescued from his unnatural grandmother by the humanity of his father's sister Jehosheba, the wife of Jehoiadah the high priest, who, in virtue of his office, presided with supreme authority over the temple, where the young prince with his nurse had been concealed six years), was thence conducted to the throne, at the age of seven full years. He reigned 40, and consequently died at the age of 47. Usher, misled by his erroneous combination of original numbers, mutilates this reign by reducing it to 39.

8. *Amaziah.*

8. *Amaziah.*

AT the age of 25 he began his reign of 29 years, and died at the age of 54*.

9. *Araziah, Azariah, or Uzziah.*

“ALL the people of the land took Azariah, who was 16 years old, and made him king in the stead of Amaziah his father†.” The parallel texts agreeing, like two living witnesses, in the article of time, supersede farther evidence. Yet notations apparently discordant create hesitation, whether Azariah were 16 years old at the decease of his father, or at some subsequent period? That text which connects the first of Uzziah’s reign with the 16th of his life, refers both to the 27th of Jeroboam II. king of Israel. This middle term in reckoning is apposite and decisive.

“IN the 38th year of Azariah king of Judah did Zachariah the son of Jeroboam reign in Samaria six months‡. These six months ended in the 39th of the same reign, A. M. 3237. Hence subtract 39, the remainder 3198 denotes the last year of Amaziah, and the 14th of Jeroboam. But the 27th of Jeroboam was the 16th of Araziah. His government therefore had a double commencement;—a minority of 12 years begun in the 15th of Jeroboam;—and a personal reign in the

* 2 Chron. xxv. 1.

† 2 Kings, xiv. 21. and 2 Chron. xxvi. 1—3.

‡ 2 Kings, xv. 8.

27th of the same reign. The 38th, 39th, 50th, and 52d, are all computed from the death of Amaziah, as if no minority had taken place. In the same manner 12 years of anarchy in Samaria, from the death of Jeroboam II. to the death of Zachariah, are in like manner omitted. By two notations however are they retained, or rather restored;—Amaziah lived 15 years after the death of Joash king of Israel * ; and Uzziah was 16 years old when he began his personal administration.

10. *Jotham.*

ONE rule for computing the lives and reigns of kings has been premised, and often exemplified. In a conjunct reign the age of the junior monarch is computed from the partnership in authority, but his sole reign from the demise of his predecessor, or it includes the last incomplete year of the former.

UZZIAH, it is well known, had been smitten by the hand of Heaven with an incurable leprosy ; unto the day of his death he dwelt in a several house, secluded from society ; and Jotham his son was over the king's house, judging the people of the land †. These circumstances indicate continuance of time. The space of the regency is not defined, but a term agreeable to the course of nature may be assumed. Suppose therefore Jotham began his vicarious reign at the age of 25, he was therefore born in the 25th of his father's life,

* 2 Kings, xiv. 17. This character of time is, on account of its importance, repeated 2 Chron. xxv. 25.

† 2 Chron. xxvi. 21.

and began his own sole reign at the age of 31; add 16 for his reign, he died at the age of 47. No remonstrance occurs, and from nature, chronology, or history, emergent difficulties in genealogy are anticipated.

11. *Ahaz.*

HIS age when he began to reign, is in two parallel texts said to have been 20*. His father, as the numbers have been transmitted, reigned 16 and lived 36 years. Ahaz was, by this reckoning, born in the 16th of Jotham. This arrangement, apposite and conciliatory as it may appear, is inadequate; for the very next step in computation infers a contradiction.

12. *Hezekiah.*

AT his accession he was 25 years old†. But as his father's life and reign did not exceed 36‡, the son was born when the father's age was but 11. Whiston pronounces this notation one of the greatest difficulties in all the Bible. On the authority of Tremellius, Usher has recourse to a retrograde computation, (his usual expedient for solving emergent perplexities), by supposing the sacred historian meant, that Ahaz was 20 years old, not when he himself, but when his father Jotham began to reign. If so, Ahaz was born in the 5th year of Jotham's age; or by the correction above proposed, in the 11th. Both these critics are extremely unfortunate.

* 2 Kings, xvi. 2. and 2 Chron. xxviii. 1.

† 2 Chron. xxix. 1.

‡ 2 Chron. xxviii. 1.

They solve one contradiction, by recommending to their readers the belief of an equal, or greater absurdity. Kennicott, in all his three voluminous dissertations, overlooks this cluster of incongruous numbers. Wall, in his note on 2 Chron. xxviii. 1. remarks, that the Complutensian, Aldine, Alexandrine, Gr. and Vulg. Lat. Pentateuch, agree with the Heb. here and in 2 Kings, xvi. 2. and that the Vat. Greek copy in the former text, reads 25 for the age of Ahaz. Whiston approves the emendation, and confirms it by the authority of the Armenian, and other versions. He might have added the two valuable printed editions of the Septuagint, that by Field in 1653, and that by Wecheliuss in 1697.

USHER, inconsistently with his own postulate, admits that Jotham was 25 years old, when his administration at the time of his father's leprosy began, and that he reigned 16 without a colleague. As above noted he died at the age of 47. Subtract 25 for the age of Ahaz, at the demise of Jotham, according to the most correct editions of the Septuagint, the surplus 22 is the age of Jotham at the birth of Ahaz: and $25 + 16 = 41$: the result indicates the last of Ahaz; then $41 - 25 = 16$, denotes the age of Ahaz at the birth of Hezekiah. Thus is surmounted every semblance of variation, in historical and chronological characters, from the course of nature. This early instance of procreation it has, in one other case, that of Rehoboam, been necessary to admit. Such examples, though not without precedents, are rare; but ought not to be rejected under the notion of

7

physical

physical improbabilities. Here we should have had two in succession, and, what must be reprobated as impossible without a miracle, a son born in the 11th of his father's life. A minute scrutiny into the usual phraseology of the sacred writers, the variations in parallel texts of the original, the discordant notations in antient versions, and contextual analogy to nature, have restored consistency with truth in many cases where palpable absurdity was otherwise unavoidable. Without the least apprehension of hurting verisimilitude, the worthy Metropolitan mentions an hypothesis which makes Ahaz born in the 5th or 11th of Jotham;—and Hezekiah in the 11th of Ahaz. Yet so little attentive was he to consequences, that he abridges by one year the life and reign of the father, and constructs a pile of absurdities. Prideaux, misled by his example, copied this last mistake, and afterward found it necessary to compensate a deficient year by adding unity to the short reign of Amon.

13. *Manasseh,*

AT the age of 12, ascended the throne. Two inferences are obvious: 1. He was born in the 42d year of his father's life, which was the 17th of his reign. 2. He was a minor, consequently a regent governed by representation four years. This long reign of 55 years* contributes both to the ease and certainty of computation: for except in one other instance, that of Uzziah, the reckoning by generations from David to

* 2 Chron. xxxiii. 1.

Zedekiah,

Zedekiah, hath been so circumscribed, both in the ascending and descending series, that it is extremely difficult to fix that one critical point in natural time, where probability is admissible, or contradiction suspected, and unavoidable.

14. *Amon.*

ON the authority of two parallel texts, he began to reign at the age of 22, and died at 24 *. That a strange fluctuation of opinion concerning this reign and life, among the ancient chronologers, did prevail, is evident from their jarring sentiments, as set forth by the Metropolitan in his *Chronologiâ Sacrâ*, p. 83. With a needless expence of investigation and argument, he combats the hypothesis of Eusebius, who assigns, on the report of the 70 interpreters, 12 years to the reign of Amon, and approves the censure of Syncellus, who gives Eusebius the lie as to the duration of this reign. It is not a little extraordinary that both these fathers acknowledge the Hebrew number to be two, and also the Septuagint number to be 12 : whereas all agree with the Hebrew, without the least vestige of a various reading in either of the parallel notations.

HE continues his strictures on other writers with respect to different views of the same subject. Sulpicius Severus, in the first book of his sacred history, affirms, that Amon's reign did not exceed two years ; but that Jofiah his son reigned no more than 21 ; for he died in

* 2 Kings, xxi. 19. and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 21.

the third year after the celebration of the memorable passover in his 18th year. This altercation discovers gross ignorance in Eusebius; Syncellus, Severus, and Archbishop Usher. They perceived incoherence somewhere, but could not descry its source: they foresaw, that if 10 years were added to the reign of the father, as many must be retrenched from that of the son. They perhaps suspected, on the hypothesis of Amon having reigned but two years, that Josiah at the age of 12 begat the first of his four sons. To the truth of this fact they were unwilling to give their sanction: to contradict it they had not courage, being persuaded that God, as oft as it might be his pleasure, could work miracles; piously referring the time and occasion of such interposition, to Infinite Wisdom.

IN short, from Eusebius bishop of Cesarea, in the fourth, to Usher archbishop of Armagh, in the seventeenth century of the Christian era, all the intermediate historians, critics, and chronologers, (if any such did exist), saw confusion and perplexity in the notations for these two kings [Amon and Josiah];—all seem to have entertained the sentiment, that every scribe possessed the faculty of plenary inspiration no less than Moses, Ezra, &c.—and all express their opinion that a mistake has been committed in the years, which define the length of their reigns. Without the least tincture of acrimony may it be remarked, that a very moderate degree of penetration would have sufficed to evince, whether the years of the two kings at the time of their investiture with royalty, were erroneous; and if rea-
sons

sons for the affirmative proposition should seem the more probable, easy it was to bring this subject to its ultimate test,—COMPUTATION.

From the point in debate obvious it is, that ten years more, than the length of Amon's reign, and ten years less, than the quantity ascribed to Josiah, would remove certain perplexities in the chronology, genealogy, and history of the period now under examination.

BE it recollected, that Manasseh reigned 55, and lived 67 years. At first view it infers no absurdity to suppose, that Amon's age, at the decease of Manasseh, might possibly have been 42. Then $67 - 42 = 25$: this surplus was, by the supposition, the age of the father at the nativity of the son:—a conclusion in perfect harmony with the course of nature, both in the retrograde and progressive series. It may be enquired, whether this position derives confirmation from the similar figure of ancient numerical characters? Answer; The characters are the same with those already produced to demonstrate, that Ahaziah king of Judah was not, and could not possibly, be two years older than his father, Jehoram. The characters מנ 42, had posterously been interchanged for כב 22; and here כב 22, for מנ 42. Thus is taken out of the way every obstacle which can produce variance between the truth of nature, and the truth of history, in the reign of Amon. The suspicion of error in the two texts, which define the reign and age of this prince, has eluded the acumen of all the critics from Eusebius down to Scaliger,

Scaliger, Petau, Usher, Prideaux, Bedford, Jackson, Kennedy, Kennicott, Wall, Whiston, the Authors of the Ancient Universal History, &c.

CERTAIN objections, too momentous to be overlooked, relative to the form, number, and order of this series, remain for examination.

Object. 1. Three Names, which the EVANGELIST excludes, are HERE interpolated.

THESE names are Ahaziah, Jehoash, and Amaziah. What reasons can be assigned for an omission, which sets at variance the records of the two Testaments? Yardley and Trapp, not to mention others, reply in general by similar queries; Why are two of Judah's descendants omitted in the first book of the Chronicles? Why did Ezra leave out seven of his progenitors? Answer: Neither of these authors proposed a full list of those families, much less a division into classes equal in numbers. They add, that Matthew in particular made no scruple of leaving out some persons well enough known, though inconsiderable in themselves; as other historians do when they give a summary account of things:—that these three, as well as any others might have been passed over;—that Jehoram married Athaliah the daughter of Ahab, against whose house a particular curse had been denounced;—that the three here omitted were of that wicked house;—and, that all three came to violent deaths.

ALLOW these arguments their full force, they might justly be extended to the exclusion of many more:—

of

of Rehoboam, Abijah, Jehoram, Ahaz, Manasse, Amon. On no probable grounds can it be alleged, that the Evangelist did omit these three names in his register; because without them it would be deficient. Much more likely it is, that certain scribes or critics, equally ignorant and presumptuous, finding more than 14 names between David and Jeconias, rashly mutilated the catalogue, by omitting three in successive order. Or the omission might be purely accidental. In the Greek, Ochozias and Ozias differ but by one syllable, and the one mistaken for the other would naturally occasion the deficiency of three names*. Among the many various readings, collected by Mill and Kuster, certain vestiges occur of intermediate names, which had anciently filled up part of the blank, though these differ from the Old Testament catalogues.

Object. 2. AHAZIAH is retained in the Royal Calendar, but excluded from the Genealogy.

IT has been noted that Jehoash, the immediate son of this prince, born in the last year of his grandfather,

* It might happen in this manner: *Ιωρὰμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν* (Οχοζίαν. Οχοζίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ιωάν. Ιωάν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀμαζίαν. Ἀμαζίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν) Οζιαν. Joram begat (Ochozias; Ochozias begat Joaz; Joaz begat Amazias, and Amazias begat) Ozias. The scribe while writing the words, *Ιωρὰμ ἐγέννησε*, might, in conducting his eye back to the copy, mistake Οζιαν for Οχοζίαν, and thus leave out the intermediate names included in the parenthesis. Future critics finding this mutilated copy more favourable to the 14 generations, prior to Jeconias, preferred it to those other copies where nothing was omitted.

Jehoram,

Jehoram, makes no blank space in the Chronology, though this one link in the chain of family-descents be withdrawn; other examples of this rule occur in the next series; and by a different scheme of arrangement, yet in reserve, Ahaziah's name it may be found expedient to replace, as necessary to complete the roll.

Object. 3. The EVANGELIST seems to close the second Series with JOSIAS, who is here reserved for the first of the third, and last Division.

ANSWER; If the register in the first chapter of Matthew be well understood, and fitly arranged, it may be requisite to comprehend Josias in this last division; especially if the number 14 be, otherwise, incomplete.

IT remains to be shewn, in the ensuing chapter, that Joseph of Nazareth was not the father of our Lord's human nature, in the strict sense of the word, and must consequently be excluded. Much less was Jesus Christ one of his own progenitors according to the flesh. From Jeconias to Jacob, the father of Joseph, are but 13 descents, and if Josiah be classed with the second series, the third is 14, minus one. The Evangelist certainly did not mean to express numbers, incommensurate with his threefold division of generations.

C H A P. IV.

THIRD SERIES OF XIV. GENERATIONS.

I. *Josiah.*

THOSE texts which define his age when his reign began, express eight years, and limit his government to 31 *. He, by this reckoning, died at the age of 39. This ultimate term of life must be considered together with the history of his family.

“THE sons of Josiah were, Johanan the first born, the second Jehoiakim, (Eliakim); the third Zedekiah, (Mattaniah); the fourth Shallum, (Jehoahaz †).”

WITH that precision whence the sacred writers never deviate, the rank of these sons in seniority is ascertained. Such minute distinctions are here necessary to prevent confusion arising from a variety of names. Not without special significance is it recorded, that “the people of the land took Jehoahaz, the *youngest son* of Josiah, and made him king in Jerusalem: his age was 23, and his reign three months ‡.” From the age of the father

* 2 Kings, xxii. 1. and 2 Chron. xxxiv. 1.

† 1 Chron. iii. 15.

‡ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 1, 2.

39, take that of the son 26, the surplus 16, is the current year of Josiah at the birth of Jehoahaz. This age of procreation, in the case of a first born, is unexceptionable; but otherwise scarcely consistent with physical probability.

Is it possible to discover the father's age at the nativity of his first three sons? The four had two mothers. Jehoiakim, (and probably Johanan), was born of Zebudah;—Zedekiah and Jehoahaz of Hamutal. Certain it is, that all were not children of the same year. For Jehoiakim the second succeeded, on the removal of Jehoahaz, at the age of 25; and was therefore born in the 14th of Josiah's life. This fact is without example in the Bible history of 42 generations, and being beyond the line of experience, may properly be transferred to the chapter of paradoxes. The same mother had, at separate births, Johanan and Jehoiakim. The elder was consequently born in the 13th or perhaps the 12th of their father's age. Here is a train of improbabilities, which distinctly, but much more in a state of composition, set even credulity at defiance. Zedekiah was the third in order, and consequently 24 years old at the death of his father, for he was the elder son by Hamutal, Jehoahaz the younger, and therefore they were not twins. Zedekiah's age at the death of Jehoiakim, 11 years after Josiah, must have been 35. But in three texts * it is erroneously marked 21.

* 2 Kings, xxiv. 18. and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 11. Jer. lii. 1.

ALL these absurdities in computation render it credible, that Josiah succeeded his father at a more advanced stage of life than eight years. By the necessary emendation above proposed, Amon died at the age of 44. The birth of Josiah may be referred to any year not repugnant to the course of nature. Be it then supposed at a venture, that the sacred historians in the two texts abovementioned wrote 18, not 8. In the Hebrew alphabet ח denotes 8, י 10, and ח' 18. The small, and sometimes scarcely perceptible character, י, might easily have been overlooked, and with it the number 10 was lost, to the great detriment not only of textual coherence, but of physical possibility.

By this highly probable conjecture every difficulty vanishes. In matters of singular intricacy even bold conjectures are justifiable; but in framing conclusions, judgment must proceed with caution and coolness. Precipitance is the bane of criticism. One enquiry still remains. Does this conjecture derive confirmation from the possible or actual interchange, omission, or transposition, of the same numerical signatures, in other instances? Supposable it is, that the like sources of perplexity may occur in various passages, where the same combination of alphabetical numbers is repeated, with the same deviations from the truth of computation. Happily one apposite example is obvious and decisive. The same pair of letters, intended to express the same age, in a distinct personage, is exhibited with the same omission of י 10. "Jehoiachin was (ח) eight years old when he began to reign, and he reigned three years
and

and ten days in Jerusalem *.” In the Aldine and Alexandrine editions of the Septuagint, as also in the Hebrew text and Greek version of 2 Kings; ch. xxiv. 8. the original notation יח^{\prime} , 18, has happily been preserved. In this latter context, a circumstance altogether incompatible with the number *eight* is recorded: “The king of Babylon took and carried away Jehoiachin, and the king’s wives.” A youth of 18 it may be presumed had wives; but this could not be affirmed of a child whose age did not exceed eight years.

No probable reason forbids the use of this arithmetical experiment, in ascertaining the real age of Josiah at the time of his accession. It is perfectly consistent with the repeated evidences of his early piety. The recorded specifications denote rather a gradual and continued progress in goodness, than a premature entrance on a religious course. For instance, “In the eighth year of his reign,” that is, the 26th of his life, “while he was yet *young*, he *began* to seek after the God of David, his father: and in the 12th year,” that is, the 30th of his life, “he *began* to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, groves, images,” &c. The Hebrew phraseology denominates men *young* at 30. Again, “In the 18th of his reign,” that is, the 36th of his life, “he issued a commission for repairing the temple, solemnised a magnificent passover, and introduced a general reformation, not only in Judah, but also in Samaria †.”

* 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9.

† 2 Chron xxxiv. 3—33.

IN the very best dispositions, the seeds and symptoms of supereminent excellence may begin to unfold themselves at the age of eight years. But schemes of public usefulness, projected with a felicity of design, and executed with persevering vigour, require a maturity of faculties ; and when young princes of such a character are providentially raised up on a conspicuous theatre, for the benefit of the human kind ; then the counsels, influence, and authority of wise and good men, in the subordinate functions of magistracy, are commonly employed to call forth into exertion the latent virtues of a young sovereign.

THUS Joash, king of Judah, from the tender age of seven years, did that which was good in the sight of the Lord all his days, wherein Jehoiadah, the high priest, instructed him *.

IN like manner young Josiah was happily instructed in the principles of wisdom, and the measures of good government, under the pious tuition of Hilkiah the high priest, and other upright counsellors, in a very degenerate age †. His heart having a right bias from the state of infancy, his virtue acquired strength from good culture, and in advanced life he discharged with eminent honour all the functions of a patriot king, with the well-directed zeal of an exemplary reformer.

By a minute disquisition into various notations of time, from Solomon to Josiah, many important emen-

* 2 Kings, xii. 2. and 2 Chron. xxiv. 2.

† 2 Kings, xxii. 2—20.

dations of numbers, which embarrass computation, have not only been suggested, but reconciled with truth and nature. It is humbly presumed, that nothing remains to shock belief, nothing to violate probability. Every decision is admissible, coherent, perspicuous. Chronology harmonises with history, and both with the regular process of nature, during the lapse of 15 generations;—a period of time which has hitherto derived very little elucidation from criticism.

2. *Jehoiakim.*

“JOSIAS begat Jeconias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon. And after they were carried away to Babylon, Jeconias begat Salathiel *.” &c.

DR. Trapp very properly observes, “The two names JEHOIAKIM and JEHOIACHIN being so like, the same Greek word serves for both. The former was the son of Josiah, and he is meant verse 11th. The latter was the son of Jehoiakim, and he is meant verse 12th †.”

NOTHING can be more conformable to history than this remark of that eminent critic. It is confirmed by the uniform report of all the Old Testament registers, and by very clear distinctions in the phraseology of this Evangelist; for instance,

* Matthew, i. 11, 12.

† Trapp's Explanatory Notes on Matthew, i. 12.

1. JOSIAS begat Jeconias and his brethren. The brethren of the former Jeconias have been already mentioned, Johanan, Jehoahaz, and Zedekiah, who were likewise the sons of Josiah. Of the second Jeconias, the name of no brother is recorded.

2. THE times, as distinct, are properly diversified. The elder Jeconias was born about the time *they* were carried away to Babylon; the younger, after *they* were brought to Babylon, begat Salathiel*.

3. THAT Jehoiakim the son, as also Jeconiah the grandson of Josiah, were both born before the first deportation to Babylon, is evident from indubitable notations already specified:—the former in the 24th, the latter in the 42d of Josiah's life, as above computed. This circumstance sufficiently evinces the diversity of persons, and prevents confusion from the identity of names.

4. DIFFERENT dates are, without the least semblance of ambiguity, assigned for the removal to Babylon;—one in the fourth of Jehoiakim's reign;—a second in the first, a third in the 11th, of Zedekiah.

5. WHO were the persons of whom the Evangelist affirms, *they* were carried, and *they* were brought, to

* Ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικησίας, *some time before*. The Lexicographers remark, that *ἐπὶ*, implying time, and as here put in construction, denotes *priority* of time, like the Latin *sub* in the same signification, as *sub noctem*, about even tide; *at the approach of night*. On the other hand, *μετα*, in this notion, unequivocally expresses time *subsequent*, as *μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετοικησίαν*, *but after the migration*.

Babylon?

Babylon? Answer: The words *before* and *after*, characterise no particular persons. Neither nominative nor verb is expressed in the original text. From our English version, an English reader would naturally suspect, that the elder Jeconias and his brethren are implied. But this Jeconias, (Jehoiakim), was not carried to Babylon. In the 11th of his reign indeed, "Nebuchadnezzar came up against him, and bound him in fetters to carry him to Babylon *." But he was never transported thither. Jeremiah had foretold †, "that he should be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem." Josephus historically records the circumstantial completion of this prophecy: "Nebuchadnezzar commanded king Jehoiakim to be thrown down before the walls of the city, without any burial!" That this was done in the 11th of his reign, and no sooner, the author expressly affirms. "His son Jehoiachin, was made king of the land, and of the city. He reigned three months and ten days ‡." This short term of sovereignty is taken in to complete the last of his father's disastrous reign: for he too was taken, and actually removed to Babylon, when that year was expired §.

NEITHER were all the brethren of the senior Jeconias transported to Babylon. Of Johanan nothing is recorded but that he was the first born of Josiah's four sons. It may be conjectured, either that he was slain

* 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6.

‡ Ant. x. 6. 3.

† Chap. xxii. 19.

§ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10.

with his father in the tragical battle of Megiddo, or was prevented by a natural death. Certain it is that the youngest, Jehoahaz, or Shallum, was dethroned, (after a reign of three months, which are also comprehended in the 31st of his father), by Pharaoh Necho, and put in chains at Riblah; and a prediction, of equal credit with history, had been emitted, “that he should die in Egypt, the place whither he had been led captive*.” Zedekiah, therefore, was the only son of Josiah, who had been carried to Babylon. This induction of circumstances terminates in the inference, that the Evangelist referred to no particular persons removed from Judah into Babylonia, neither to any particular term between the fourth of Jehoiakim, and the 11th of Zedekiah. His words however intimate, that both Jehoiakim and Jeconiah were born prior to the first captivity of Judah;—that Salathiel was born some time after the transportation of his father;—but the precise interval is, in neither case, defined: nor was it necessary. The register allows a latitude of interpretation. Jehoiakim might have been near 36 years old before he was put in fetters; and Salathiel might have been born before the captivity of Zedekiah.

6. MILL and Kuster, on the passage, quote numerous and respectable authorities for reading, “Josias begat Jakeim, or Joakeim; and Jakeim, or Joakeim, begat Jeconias.” Though Laud, Selden, Petau, H. Stevens, and a cloud of other witnesses, give their sanc-

* Jerem. xxii. 11, 12.

tion to this supposed improvement; yet the more ancient fathers, Epiphanius, Austin, Ambrose, Irenæus, &c. censure the proposed change of names as an innovation; because, in their judgement, the words as anciently read and still extant, are sufficiently discriminated, though the names are the same *. Zedekiah, as the brother of Jehoiakim, is excluded from the genealogy of this period; but retains his rank as the last of the kings, who sat on the throne of David.

* Yardley adopts the opinion of Trapp, in applying the same name to the son and grandson of Josiah; conformably to the authority of the Christian fathers, above mentioned. This decision supercedes the use and necessity of the various readings collected by Mill and Kuster, which seem to bring the suspicion of inaccuracy on the text of the Evangelist, as now read. This diversity of sentiments among the ancient and modern critics, only shews that variations had crept into the several copies of this gospel, even in the second century of our era. In a matter where certainty is unattainable, and either clause of an alternative, unimportant, every judicious reader is left to his own discretion. Perfectly consistent with this freedom of choice is the remark, that the correction, supplied by our modern critics, seems much more agreeable to the form of the Catalogue, which in other instances repeats the same name, first in the relation of a son, and next of a father: "Josias begat Joiakim, and Joiakim begat Jeconias."

C H A P. V.

CHRONOLOGICAL Problems solved by Genealogy.

THIS subject, being retrospective, may be pronounced a deviation from strict method. But it could nowhere else be introduced more naturally; and its subservience to future arrangements will, it is hoped, recommend it as an interlude, which tends rather to diversify, than retard the prosecution of the primary undertaking, or mar its final effect.

OF modern chronologers Sir Isaac Newton was the first who, with a degree of penetration, peculiar to himself, (successfully applied genealogy, as a middle term, for adjusting to the course of nature the chronology of the Gentiles in the fabulous ages), made important discoveries. It is to be regretted, that he did not adopt for his standard the Hebrew computation, as extant in the original records of the sacred canon; and not as exhibited by Petau, Scaliger, Usher, and their followers. To him, however, the learned world is indebted for certain improvements in the art of historical combination, no less useful than singular.

I. H E

1. HE makes the proper distinction between generations and reigns, which quantities Herodotus, and other Gentile writers, erroneously confounded, as equivalent and commensurate.

2. IN his elaborate work, the CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT KINGDOMS AMENDED, is the mean term of intervals, in family descents, fixed to three successions in a century. If the reckoning proceed in the line of the eldest sons, 28, or at the most 30 years, is the measure of a generation: if in that of younger brothers, 33; that is three in a century at an average.

3. IN computing by reigns, and by the first born sons, 18 is the common measure; if by younger brothers 20, or five reigns for a century. These distinctions between generations and reigns, founded in common sense, are eminently servicable in regulating history. For in the words of this great author, "The reigns of kings are shorter than generations, because kings are succeeded not only by their eldest sons, but sometimes by their brothers. Sometimes they are slain or deposed, and succeeded by others of an equal or greater age, especially in elective or turbulent kingdoms*." For these obvious reasons, generations, -counted in the line of kings, are shorter than in families of a subordinate rank. In hereditary monarchies, the apparent heirs contract early marriages from political motives; while others, not provided with equal advantages for rearing a family, defer connubial engagements to a more advanced stage of life.

* Newton's Chronology, page 54.

ONE other remark, to this purpose is not here to be superseded. Sir Isaac Newton reckons the proportionate quantum, both in generations and reigns, from the abbreviated term of natural life, which was first reduced to its present standard about the time of Saul. Some of the arrangements with respect to the ancient history, if so it may be called, of Egypt and Greece, this very respectable author has brought too low; and on this account, a greater latitude in computation for those early periods is reasonable.

IN the Hebrew records the vouchers for the mean length of generations, and the real measure of single magistracies, are much more explicit, regular, continuous, (not to say far more authentic), than in those of paganism, the earliest of which are comparatively recent. An abridged scheme of the genealogy, in the times of the patriarchs and judges, has been given in the foregoing chapters of this Analysis: and it is judged requisite to subjoin a more minute specimen of fundamental principles in computation, during the period of regal government from Saul to Zedekiah.

THE construction and uses of the following table, will, it is hoped, be much more perspicuous from explanatory notes on each column, than it could have been made by preliminary rules for the illustration of its several parts.

A. M.

REMARKS ON SERIES II and III

269

A. M.	Names						
2911	[Saul consecrated]	-	-	*31	40	71	
2921	David born	-	-	30	40	70	
2971	Solomon	-	-	*20	39	60	
3004	Rehoboam	-	-	31	*27	17	44
3020	Abijah	-	-	16	*28	3	31
3038	Afa	-	-	18	*13	40	54
3057	Jehoshaphat	-	-	19	35	24	60
3078	Jehoram	-	-	21	*36	8	44
3100	[Ahaziah]	-	-	22	23	1	24
	[Athaliah]	-	-	00	00	6	00
3123	[Joash]	-	-	23	7	40	47
3145	[Amaziah]	-	-	22	25	29	54
3195	Uzziah	-	-	50	*4	52	56
3220	Jotham	-	-	25	*31	16	47
3242	Abaz	-	-	22	*25	16	41
3258	Hezekiah	-	-	16	25	29	54
3300	Manasseh	-	-	42	12	55	67
3325	Amon	-	-	25	*42	2	44
3351	Josiah	-	-	26	*18	31	49
	[Jehoahaz]	-	-	00	00	00	00
3375	Jehoiakim	-	-	24	25	11	36
3393	Jeconiah	-	-	18	00	00	55
3421	[Zedekiah deposed]	-	-	28	*35	11	46
2971							
				450	492	510	1054

450

Explanatory

Explanatory Notes.

As to the construction of the table, the numbers in column i. denote the intervals of births, those in column ii. the years of the kings at their accession ; iii. the duration of reigns ; iv. of lives. Its uses are briefly to be considered.

Column i. Intervals of Descent.

THE date of each birth is connected with the current years of the world towards the left hand margin, on the same horizontal line ; and to such years the other columns of numbers have no reference.

INCLOSED in brackets are the names which do not belong to the genealogical register of thrice 14 generations, as framed by the Evangelist. The descendants from Jeconias II. to Jesus Christ exclusively, are 13 : and those between David, the last of the first series, and the same Jeconias, 18 : and $18 + 12 = 30$, a surplus of twice 14 by two units, or descents.

As the line of genealogy is continued from Judah, Saul the Benjamite is properly excluded. For this reason, the year of the world for his birth is not marked ; but that of his consecration, which assigns him a rank among the kings. The word *born* annexed to David's name is to be supposed after those of his progeny, who reigned one full year. Ahaziah indeed is of this number, and his name was most probably in the original record, though not as one of the second series in the genealogy. The Evangelist had more respect to the continuity of
time,

time, than to the *number* of names. Joash, the son of this prince was born in the last year of his father's life, and is not improperly represented, as the immediate successor, in blood, to his grandfather Jehoram.

ALL those learned men, who have critically examined this catalogue, admit, that the truth of the genealogy does not require an exact enumeration of Christ's ancestors, though they have not been successful in their conjectures concerning its original structure.

JEHOIAKIM may, for a similar reason, be retained in the list of kings, yet must be excluded from the genealogy, if Joseph be inserted. His son was the first of those princes, condemned to exile in Babylon; and his birth was more nearly connected in *time* with that disastrous incident, than that of his father: for his age at the time of Josiah's death was seven years, and he may no less properly than Joash be reckoned the immediate successor of his grandfather. "*About the time they were carried away to Babylon,*" is a significant circumstance which seems both to suggest and authorise this arrangement.

ATHALIAH, as a female, can have no place in this roll. Her age is not defined, either at the time of her usurpation, or of her tragical end. As a sovereign she reigned, or rather domineered, six years, and as such only her name is introduced in the royal calendar of the Jews.

THE name of Jehoahaz is inclosed in brackets, because he was not the father of Jehoiakim. His short reign is included in the last of Josiah, as is that of the
second

second Jeconias in the last of his father. Zedekiah is here inserted as a king, not as a constituent member in the genealogy.

THUS the names from David to Josias, excluding both, are reduced to 14 generations; and from Josias to Jesus Christ, the last not included, to the same precise number. Hence results the probable conclusion, that the Evangelist's catalogue, as now restored, will fairly admit this arrangement. But it remains to be shewn, in a distinct chapter, in perfect consistence with the truth of computation, and with every circumstance in the catalogue itself, that the names of Ahaziah and Jehoiakim may be replaced; nay, that without them the register is incomplete.

As it is impossible to discover in what year of Jeconias II. his son, Salathiel was born, the intermediate space cannot be defined by certain intervals. The mode of computation for the third series, in which the mean quantity of generations must be ascertained by an equation, obviously differs from that of the two former.

FROM the 11th of Zedekiah, A. M. 3421, is deducted the year of Solomon's birth 2971: and the surplus, 450, divided by 17, the number of the names, not inclosed in brackets, quotes 26 years eight months for the equated ages of the several fathers at the birth of their specified sons. But, if Ahaziah be taken into the reckoning, 450, divided by 18, the mean space between descents is precisely 25. The solution of this chronological problem evinces, that the truth of computation

is not affected by a small variation of numbers during the rotation of four or five centuries: and if generations in the line of kings be commonly shorter than in other families, the reason has already been suggested, that the princes in hereditary monarchies generally marry at an earlier period than other men. Hence a less protracted interval in descents. This inference rests on the sure basis of historical evidence; for from Abraham to David, as also from Josiah to Christ, such intervals are much longer in private families, than in the intermediate series from kings.

By a critical examination of the records, whence this register is extracted, it recovers its primeval and genuine form. Mutilations, the result of accident, presumptuous ignorance, or superficial erudition, are restored; and the New Testament brought to harmonise in every note with the old. Every aspect of a paradox assumes the hue of plain truth, and the course of nature seems uniform in operation, suitably to the fixed appointment of an immutable God. The only instances of apparently premature generation, occur in the case of Rehoboam and Ahaz, whose sons, Abijah and Hezekiah, it must be admitted, were but 16 years younger than their fathers. Here is no physical improbability. Such examples may be uncommon, but not incredible. Early puberty, in some individuals, is the result of constitution, or, in many more, depend on the influence of climate. In China it is said the ladies are mothers at 12, grandmothers at 24, and superannuated at 30.—Neither is it supposed, in the lapse of 16 generations,

T

that

that the prolific faculty lasted to the period of extreme senility. In the table are but two examples of procreation at 50, and beyond that age none.

Column ii. Age of Accession.

THUS far KINGS have been considered, not in their public capacity, but in their domestic relations, as progenitors and descendants. “Concerning those of David’s race, 21 in number,” Josephus affirms, “that they reigned 514 years, six months, and ten days. Saul was the first;” (certainly not of David’s family *). “The 18 kings of Judah, who succeeded Solomon, reigned 390 years, which is, one with another, 22 years apiece†.” Add Saul, David, and Solomon, with the sum of their reigns, $40 + 40 + 39 = 119$; the number of the sovereigns is, as before, 21; that of their reigns 510. Neither Josephus nor Sir Isaac did recollect, that the three months of Jehoahaz, and the three months ten days of Jehoiachin, being taken in to complete the last deficient year of their respective fathers, give them no right to a place in the royal calendar. Their number is thus reduced to 19, without Saul and Athaliah.

AT the bottom of column ii. the number 492 denotes the sum of years prior to the accession of the several princes. By 20 divide 492, the quotient, 24 years seven months, is the mean proportion of age, when each assumed the sceptre. The result of this operation

* Ant. x. 8. 4.

† Newt. Chron. p. 52.

varies but in a small degree from the mean interval of descents. Thus are the computations in the two columns subservient to reciprocal confirmation. It is to be remarked, that four of the young princes were minors.

OF the numbers in this column marked with asterisks, the use is now to be explained. The number of reigns thus distinguished is 12. In some cases the notations of age are altogether omitted; for example, Solomon, Abijah, Afa: in others the notation is partial—"Saul," as the text is now read, "was the son of one year *." In certain texts the numbers are impaired, in others enlarged.

Years omitted.				Years added.			
Saul	-	-	30	Rehoboam	-	-	14
Solomon	-	-	20	Amon	-	-	20
Abijah	-	-	28	Uzziah	-	-	16
Afa	-	-	13				<hr/>
Joram	-	-	4				50
Jotham	-	-	6	<i>Mistakes corrected by parallel Texts.</i>			
Ahaz	-	-	5				
Josiah	-	-	10	Ahaziah said to have been 42 years old. The true number 22.			
Zedekiah	-	-	14				
			<hr/>				
			130	Jeconiah eight years old.			
				The true number 18.			

THESE mistakes, proceeding from various sources, and promiscuously dispersed in records framed with the utmost precision for defining the parts of time, in a continuous

* 1 Sam. xiii. 1.

series of years and generations, are sufficient to spread a gloom of obscurity over the history of 4000 years. It is one character of pre-eminent excellence in the sacred writings, that they comprehend in themselves the means of rectifying such oversights as disfigure their surface, through the unavoidable imperfection of fallible men. The Bible has surmounted a multiplicity of trials. It has stood the test of criticism. Let the same experiment be applied to the dynasties of Egypt; the immensely amplified chronology of the Chaldeans, Chinese, Gentoos, Hindoos, &c.; the operator will find, that the farther he proceeds, the greater will be his distance from light and truth, from coherence, order, and certainty.

Column iii. Length of Reigns.

“ IN the later ages, since chronology hath been exact, scarce is an instance to be found, of ten kings reigning any where in continual succession, above 260 years * ;” that is, 26 years apiece.

WHISTON has evinced the fallacy of this position by referring to the testimony of authentic history, (in times much later than the era to which Sir Isaac alludes), where it is shewn that 12 kings in England, from William the Conqueror to Richard III. reigned in continual succession $27\frac{3}{4}$ years each:—that 12 kings in France, from Rupert to Philip IV. reigned in continual succession $32\frac{3}{4}$ years apiece †.”

* Newton's Chronology.

† Confutation of Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology, 1728.

It merits serious observation, that in an age before chronology was exact, a certain class of men, the Hebrew prophets and historians, wrote according to nature and truth, the transactions of 21 reigns in continual succession, almost equal to twice 260 years. The number at the bottom of column iii. is 510. Divide this sum by 21, the mean quantity of reigns is 24 years 3 months. This great man meant nothing less than to invalidate the authority of the sacred records. But his zeal to explode the incredible antiquity of the pagan establishments induced him to abbreviate the measures in computation; and in many instances, especially his arrangement for the age of Sesostris, he has assigned too late a period for the rise of the Egyptian monarchy; and likewise for several notable epochs subsequent to the introduction of an accurate chronology; particularly the origin of Rome, which he brings too low by 126 years.

Column iv. Duration of Lives.

OUR British bills of mortality, if the facts be reported with precision, are of signal use for ascertaining the advance or decay of population, the yearly result of national maladies, and the more critical seasons of life, with respect to the probable chances of longevity. From such documents has it been found, that the one half of the human race scarcely survives the age of five years. Whatever light political arithmetic, or medical practice, may derive from authentic records of this kind, they have not yet been applied to a discovery of

great importance for evincing the utility of genealogy in chronological disquisitions. Much is it regretted, that so very few ingenious men, enriched with the treasures of erudition, and qualified by a penetrating faculty of OBSERVATION, have attempted to fix that intermediate point of time, which is at nearly an equal distance from the birth of a family successor, and the ultimate term of life, in the times subsequent to its abbreviation : for example ; suppose the line of descent be continued, so as that every 34th year should be the first of a new generation ; and that 70 years are, with a very few exceptions, the ultimate period of natural life :—in what year of the current generation, (thus computed), does the father usually die ?

THIS query has escaped the sagacity of Sir Isaac Newton, of Trapp, Yardley, and others, whose professed subject is our Lord's genealogy. Its solution, however, seems to be momentous.

MOSES tells us, that Adam lived 130 years and begat Seth ; that Adam lived after he begat Seth 800 years, and died at the age of 930. With all these specifications of time is the genealogy of the patriarchs continued down to Isaac. With Jacob the notation of births, by the current year of each father, ends, and the chronology is expressed by fixed periods, but not without a specific reference to the genealogy. For instance, the 430 years of sojourning are divided into two equal parts. The former computed from the 75th of Abraham exclusively to the 130th of Jacob, fills up 215 years, and four generations born in Canaan, Isaac,

Jacob, Judah, and Pharez : the latter, from the 130th of Jacob to the 80th of Moses, comprehends the same quantity of time, measured likewise by four generations, born in Egypt ; Hezron, Aram, Aminadab, Nahshon. “ Afterward they” (the Israelites) “ shall come out *in the* FOURTH GENERATION, with great substance *.”

THE next period of 480 extends from the egress to the foundation of the first temple, and includes a part of six generations from Nahshon to Solomon. With David commenced a two-fold mode of ascertaining chronology ;—by generations and reigns. But the sacred historians judging it improper to mention the several kings, prior to their investiture with sovereignty, generally mark with cardinal numbers the complete years, past at the date of their accession ; and it is remarkable, that though the age of the patriarchs born after the egress, is not defined ; yet that of all the kings posterior to Saul is virtually recorded ; because the years of their several reigns, added to those before their accession, are the sum of their years at the time of their demise.

IT is still more remarkable, that those personages only, who were not in the line of the genealogy, are excepted. The age of Athaliah when she ascended her son’s throne is omitted, because she was an usurper and a female : yet the length of her usurpation is defined, to prevent a blank in the computation by reigns.

* Gen. xv. 14. 16.

ON the other hand, the ages of Jehoahaz, of Jehoiachin, and of Zedekiah, at the accession of each, are specified (the second not without a variation, the third erroneously); also the duration of their reigns, though the first two do not enlarge the chronology. All three were removed, and, as private characters, died in a state of degradation, ignominy, and exile. Impossible it therefore is, to ascertain the length of their lives; and were it possible, it is needless, because these three names are excluded from the genealogy.

It is farther to be noted, as a peculiarity of the chronological numbers in the history of the kings, that the royal calendar of Samaria does not mention at what age the kings over the ten tribes ascended the throne. The duration of their reigns is specified. So much was indispensably necessary to characterise coincident years, in coexistent reigns, and to circumscribe the prophetic period of 390, from the dismembering of the kingdom after Solomon; and no farther did the intent of the inspired historians extend.

THE question now recurs. Why is the chronology of the kings over Judah discriminated with so many singular and appropriate marks of precision? Why is the age of each, at the time of his accession, expressed, and not only so, but repeated, together with the length of the several reigns?

ONE reason occurs. It was, doubtless, to give the chronology of the period an additional character of certainty and perfection, by bringing it to the infallible test of genealogy, that the notations of time, should
they

they be accidentally corrupted, (which in several cases has happened), might be restored to purity by adjusting them to the uniform course of nature in generation *.

THIS last column comprehends 21 lives, of which the sum is 1054; or 50 years three months each. Thus every 51st year is the intermediate point in time, equidistant from the birth of a family successor, (the common interval supposed to be 30), and from 70, the usual period of longevity.

IN this roll the shortest life is 24, the longest 71. But they were the lives of kings, who, from the

* For any thing known to the author of these sheets, this only possible method of correction has now, for the first time, been attempted. The disquisition has been a work of labour. Disappointment was often the result, in many steps of his procedure. By adding the age of accession to the length of every reign, was the duration of each life discovered; and the effect of retrograde computation pointed out the current year of every sovereign at the nativity of his successor. If the year thus either assumed, or found, were apparently discordant with history, every circumstance was brought into juxtaposition, compared with discrimination, and a conclusion framed, according to the highest probability. If the year discovered were repugnant to the course of nature, three expedients occurred; 1. A minority, and consequently a regency. 2. A conjunct reign, whence the history dates invariably the age of the junior sovereign. 3. An erroneous note of number, arising from the similar figures of numerical signatures in the Hebrew alphabet. With deference are his researches, and conclusions, submitted to the decision of candid and impartial judges.

accidents

accidents already enumerated, have fewer chances of longevity than other men. Eight of this number were cut off by a violent death. The last two were dethroned, and no account of their age occurs *. On these principles it is a fair conjecture, that men in private life survive the birth of their heirs 25 years at an average.

* “ It came to pass in the 37th year of Jehoiachin’s captivity, in the 12th month, on the 27th day of the month, that Evil-Merodac, the successor of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, did lift up the head of Jehoiachin, out of prison: and he spake kindly unto him, and set his throne above the throne of the kings who were with him in Babylon; and changed his prison-garments: and he did eat bread continually before him, all the days of his life. His allowance was a continual allowance, given him of the king, a daily rate for every day, all the days of his life.” 2 Kings, xxv. 27. The 37th of Jehoiachin’s captivity was the 55th of his age. This quotation mentions an allowance for his support, all his days, which evidently implies that he survived his enlargement from the prison several years. But on this surmise, though it were certain, nothing depends. Salathiel might have been born about the time of Zedekiah’s degradation, or 52 years before the return from Babylon; and Zerubabel, the grandson of Jehoiachin, might in the first of Cyrus conduct the captives back to their own land.

C H A P. VI.

*Continuation of the Third Series.*3. *Coniah, Jehoiachin, or Jeconias II.*

“ **O** EARTH, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord ; write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his day ; for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, or ruling any more in Judah *.” This solemn denunciation is not to be literally interpreted. Kings may be said to be fathers in two respects. Heirs of their blood and of their dignity, are in different senses their children. Jeconias was in both respects the son of Jehoiakim ; but in the latter sense only was Zedekiah the son of Jeconias. He succeeded him on the throne, and was the last of David’s race who ruled in Judah. The denunciation does not imply the extinction of Jeconiah’s family, but expressly affirms the dissolution of the monarchy, as the words are properly applied. In this view the threatening is equivalent to another on the

* Jer. xxii 29, 30.

same subject, though in different terms: "The Lord said, I will remove Judah also out of my sight, as I removed Israel, and will cast off this city Jerusalem *," &c.

4. *Salathiel*, Shealtiel.

"THE sons of Jeconiah, Assir, Salathiel †," &c. "Tremellius thinks he had no son called Assir, nor any son at all;—that the word Assir here is not the name of a man, but signifies bound or captive;—and that the words should run thus; the sons of Jeconiah the captive, Salathiel, Malchiram, and Pedaiah," &c.

THIS conjecture has every aspect of truth. Frequent examples occur of names imposed on children, in allusion to historical incidents. The eldest son of Moses, born in Midian, was called Gershom, *a stranger there*, and for a like reason the first born of Levi in Egypt.

5. *Zorobabel*.

IN Mat. i. 12. he is said to be the son of Salathiel, and in 1 Chron. iii. 19. the son of Pedaiah. But either way he was the grandson of Jeconias. Other difficulties occur, for which Grotius, Trapp, and Yardley, (to whom the learned reader is referred), offer not improbable solutions. Of Zorobabel's sons and more remote descendants, the names in the *Chronicles* differ entirely from those in the *Evangelist*, unless Abiud *here* be the

* 2 Kings, xxiii. 27.

† 1 Chron. iii. 17.

same with Obadiah, a grandson of Zorobabel *there*.
 “ It is observable, that both he and his sons might have different names ; one in their own family, and another among the people to whom they were captives. It was scarce safe for Zorobabel to be called in Babylon by that name, which signifies the *winnowing of Babel*; and therefore he was among the Babylonians called Shezhbazzar. So his sons were called Meshullam and Hananiah ; because the one could scarce properly, as well as scarce safely, be called *Abiud, my father's glory* ; the other *Rhesa, a prince* *.”

THE remaining names in this Evangelist's register, denote personages posterior to the close of the Old Testament canon, and are, without doubt, copied from authentic vouchers. They are, 6. Abiud, 7. Eliakim, 8. Azor, 9. Sadoc, 10. Achim, 11. Eliud, 12. Eleazar, 13. Matthan, 14. Jacob. Thus is the line of pedigree continued to Joseph and Mary, the one not the natural father of our Lord's humanity, the other excluded, by her sex, from the Hebrew genealogy.

JOSIAS has been placed at the head of the third series. From what point in physical time the date of the next generation should be reckoned, is doubtful. Whether from the birth of Jeconias II. in the 42d of Josiah's life, or from that more remarkable term, his removal from the throne, seems to be an indifferent matter, the difference is but 18 years. Certain it is

* Dr. Joseph Trapp's note on Matt. i. 13.

that his son, Salathiel, was not born before the transportation to Babylon.

CHRIST was born A. M. 4004, and Jeconiah was made a captive in 3411. But, as Salathiel was not born before the conflagration of the temple and city, the reckoning by the fourth generation from Josiah inclusively may be deferred to the 29th of Jehoichin's life, coincident with the 11th of Zedekiah, and the presumed date of Salathiel's birth, A. M. 3421. This sum deduct from the historical year of Christ's nativity 4004, the surplus is 583. From the unavoidable deficiency of genealogical notations, no expedient, for finding a mean proportion, is accessible otherwise than by an equation. By 11, the number of generations from Jeconias to Joseph, excluding both, divide 583, the quotient, 53 years precisely, is the common interval of descents. Evident it is, that this quantity exceeds the space between generations in the line of royalty, by almost a half. But here is no mystery; for reasons have been assigned for princes marrying sooner than other men; and also for the various accidents, which often prevent their longevity.

It has likewise been noted, that, from the time of Arphaxad's birth, the mean length of generations has uniformly been somewhat more than 30 years;—that no sooner was the promise intimated to Abraham, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, than procreation in that line made slower advances;—that from David to Jehoiachin, the interval fell below
the

the common standard ;—and thenceforward, it is now evinced, that, during the space of almost six centuries, the usual term of procreation in that line was lengthened by about 20 years. It was evidently the intent of over-ruling Providence, that the number of Christ's ancestors, according to the flesh, should, comparatively, be few ; and it seems not inconsistent with the great designs of essential Wisdom, that his progenitors should, like Abraham, have their faith and patience long tried, by the discipline of a steadfast expectation. “ They staggered not through unbelief, but against hope believed in hope.”

MR. Yardley sees no occasion for inserting Joseph's name in this register, because he does not supply the place of one generation. *Genealogies*, p. 220. By this regulation is Jehoiakim restored to his rank as one of our Lord's progenitors : and thus is the threefold division completed without the defect or excess of a single name.

C H A P. VII.

*New Scheme of the Generations from ABRAHAM to
JESUS CHRIST.*

IN computation by TIME, whether absolute, or with reference to GENERATIONS, special regard is due to two terms, a first commencement, and a final period.

MOSES, in describing the formation of the universe, characterises a natural day by its parts, EVENING and MORNING, and counts three such days prior to the existence of the luminaries. The source of computation is that moment, when the Creator said, "LET LIGHT BE." As soon as this glorious production of Omnipotence was collected into that great orb the SUN, to the planets were assigned their circuits, "to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness." Hence the true origin of measured time by the motion of the spheres around the centre of light.

OF natural days are composed weeks, the most ancient combination of times into an integral part, by repetition, and, of all subsequent weeks, the primeval is, in its form and dimensions, the model. In reckon-
ing,

ing, however, it is itself excluded; that memorable day, on which the Almighty rested from all his works, being here considered purely as the first source of computation, by septenary systems of natural days.

IN like manner the reckoning by generations must proceed. When a first ancestor is found in history, the genealogist considers him only as the father of his race, a term of commencement, the point whence generations begin. Suppose a long roll, in the lineal, or sometimes perhaps, the collateral series progressively, continued to the passing age, the living representative of that first ancestor is left out, and the intermediate descents are alone counted.

FOR example: "This is the book of the generations of Adam; in the day that God created man." Adam, not having a human father and mother, was not *generated*; neither can it properly be said, that he was one of his own offspring. The roll is brought down to Shem, the 10th from Adam exclusively. Shem was born in a specified year of Noah's life. That year is the date of the 10th generation, and its final period is the year of Arphaxad's nativity. On this principle, the intermediate descents from Adam to Shem, excluding both, are nine generations, and no more.

WHY should it be presumed, that the Evangelist, in constructing his Catalogue, adopted a different mode in computation? "The book of the generation of JESUS CHRIST, the son of DAVID, the son of ABRAHAM." Abraham could not be one of his own progeny; and Jesus Christ certainly was not one of his own human
U progenitors.

progenitors. What if this *new scheme* should serve as a key framed for opening the mysteries, involved in the genealogies of both TESTAMENTS, by restoring to the Evangelist's register those names in the original records, which either by accident, ignorance, or injudicious criticism, have been retrenched from the first chapter of the gospel history * ? The Evangelist, in his triple division of names, invariably connects historical events with persons, and consequently chronology with generations. This happy union of middle terms, in computation, merits the heedful regard of all, who, with the probability of success, enter into disquisitions on this complicated subject.

“ IN regard three estates of the Hebrew commonwealth were more remarkable ;—as first in a state of growth or increase, and governed by patriarchs, prophets, and judges, to the time of David (no account being taken of the time of Saul, which was tragical and unhappy, and hastened by the precipitate desires of the people, before the time which God had chosen for the monarchy) ; next, its regal state, as it was governed by a race of kings from David to the time of the Babylonish captivity ; and lastly, in its weaker state of declension and dependence, as this abolition of the regal power was followed by a succession of ducal governors and chief priests, who ruled with the assistance of the

* The author ventures to call this attempt a *new scheme*, because he has not seen it suggested by any of the judicious and learned critics, in any of their works, (to which he has had access), in considering this subject.

Sanhedrim till Herod's assumption of the government, not long before the birth of Jesus.—It was St. Matthew's view to divide so long a tract of time, with an eye to these remarkable changes in the government. This is agreeable to the method of most historians, when they would give a succinct view of any nation, from first to last (as of the Romans for example, who were governed first by kings, then by consuls, dictators, and decemvirs, and last of all by emperors); and it might give an intimation, that upon the birth of Christ, at a like distance of generations with the former, another change of affairs might be expected in the erection of that kingdom, which should never be destroyed *."

THE four historical events to which the Evangelist alludes, and which this quotation exemplifies, in the commencement, progress, and end of the thrice XIV. generations, are, the call of Abraham, when the first notable distinction between his elect progeny and the profane gentiles took place:—the full establishment of that singular and marvellous constitution, the Hebrew polity:—its dissolution by the first overthrow of the city and temple, together with the temporary dispersion of the Jews:—the consummation of the law by Moses, and the departure of Judah's sceptre, with the vacancy of David's throne.

SUFFICE it to observe, in general, that the chronological characters of these events need not be so accurately distinguished, by years, months, and days, as in

* Berriman's Boyle Lect. vol. ii. Sermon. v.

the foregoing historical arrangements. Neither is so much precision requisite in determining what individuals belong to the end of one series, or the beginning of another, as has been employed to preserve an agreement between chronology, and the course of nature in procreation. The true intent of this triple division does not demand investigation so minute, or dates fixed with such exactness. It is, however, fit to apply this remark to the particular periods already mentioned, lest the notations of time, and of family descents, which the Evangelist has, in every stage, been so attentive to connect, should be disjoined.

I. The absurdity of making Abraham stand in the front of that catalogue, which professedly contains the names of his immediate and remote descendants, suggests the expedient of considering him only as the primary source of computation, and not as the first name in the first series of XIV. generations.

MUCH more proper it were to begin with the time of his death. Nor is it necessary to bring the term of reckoning so low. The date of the sojourning is much more reasonable. But the most commodious of all may be the time of Isaac's birth, that branch of the revered patriarch's family, in whom blessings for all nations were reserved.

Objection.

The intermediate Generations from Abraham to Solomon, excluding both, are thus reduced to thirteen.

ON the hypotheses of all those respectable expositors who have taken in hand to adjust the computation and numbers

numbers of the Evangelist, to the Hebrew records, admit that he might, without incurring the censure of a deviation from truth, select such names as were suitable to his views, and sometimes omit two or three descents in succession, together with the usual distinction between immediate and remote descendants, or between those of the direct and transverse line: nay, that he might insert fewer names than 14 in one series, and more in another, provided all three contained nearly the number 42. Those who approve such loose positions, have no right, in the present case, to urge the objection, which is frivolous. But as this solution may be pronounced unsatisfactory and evasive, a direct reply may enforce conviction, when a subterfuge can bear no stress.

It has been noted, on Ruth, iv. 20. that the original text reads, (and, for any thing alleged to the contrary), in all its copies, “Nahshon begat Salmah, and Salmon begat Boaz.” If Salmah were the son, and Salmon the grandson of Nahshon, David certainly was the 14th in descent from Abraham exclusively. The restoring of this name to the catalogue surmounts two difficulties, more perplexing than the objection. 1. It shortens the space between generations from Nahshon to David; and, 2. Obviates the physical impossibility of the supposition, that Rachab was the mother of Boaz by Salmon. If, on the other hand, she were the wife of Salmah, she was also the grandmother of Boaz. Thus Chronology accords with the course of nature, and the Hebrew text with the Evangelist’s first series of

XIV. generations. But, even without recourse to this expedient, the register may be completed, consistently with chronology and history, which is now to be evinced.

II. THE time with which the second series begins is characterised by no determinate period in history. David projected the building of the temple, Solomon executed the work according to the model given, and with the funds laid up for that purpose. If the Evangelist connected the chronology with this period of the history, it seems an indifferent matter whether he considered the 13th generation from Abraham, as current, or the 14th as begun. It was his design to retain the division of Christ's ancestors exemplified in their history; the first and last class being private persons, the second kings; and as David was the first of this intermediate rank, the division comes near to equality, even though Solomon be counted the last of the first series. If, as Dr. Berriman not improperly conjectures, this triple distribution were made, rather with a reference to the political changes of the Hebrew government, in its rise and growth, declension and dismembered state, partial dissolution, and loss of independence, than to a minute distinction of generations;—then the first period ends with Solomon, at the time of his demise, when the kingdom, divided against itself, was verging to the period of extinction.

III. The transportation to Babylon is an event described with such latitude, as admits either Josias, Jehoiakim, or Jeconias, to be placed at the top of the third series, regard being still had to the triple directory
for

for arrangement ;—chronology, genealogy, and history. If Josias be preferred, all the three are in perfect unison.

IV. THE last period, with which the third series terminates, the Evangelist defines by the time of Herod's death, and of his son's accession. If this notation be connected with the Roman history, this last number of the last series is brought into coincidence with the reign of Augustus, under whom the fourth empire rose, and the foundation was laid of a kingdom never to be destroyed. Thus even the testimony of prophecy ascertains the final period of the thrice XIV. generations.

Result of this new Scheme.

Series I.	II.	III.
1. Isaac.	1. Rehoboam.	1. Josiah.
2. Jacob.	2. Abijah.	2. Jehoiakim.
3. Judah.	3. Afa.	3. Jehoiachin.
4. Pharez.	4. Jehoshaphat.	4. Salathiel.
5. Hezron.	5. Jehoram.	5. Zorobabel.
6. Aram.	6. Ahaziah.	6. Abiud.
7. Aminadab.	7. Jehoash.	7. Eliakim.
8. Nahshon.	8. Amaziah.	8. Azor.
<i>Salmah.</i>		
9. Salmon.	9. Uzziah.	9. Sadoc.
10. Boaz.	10. Jotham.	10. Achim.
11. Obed.	11. Ahaz.	11. Eliud.
12. Jesse.	12. Hezekiah.	12. Eleazar.
13. David.	13. Manasseh.	13. Matthan.
14. Solomon.	14. Amon.	14. Jacob.
		<i>Joseph.</i>
		<i>Christ.</i>

IN the first series Salmah's name, though without a number, is retained. From an inviolable regard to fidelity, a character essential to just criticism, the author is constrained to acknowledge, that he is at a loss how to determine this doubtful article in computation. On a serious examination of the arguments on either side, (for this subject is now, for the third time, resumed), he, with a mixture of caution and diffidence, exhibits his singular opinion to public view.

I. The names *Salmah* and *Salmon* are uniformly expressed, as distinct persons, in the Heb. text of Ruth, iv. 20 and 21, without the discordant authority of one various reading; and this distinction is preserved in Queen Elizabeth's English Bible, printed by Robert Barker in 1610.

II. IF the distinction be admitted, the length of the generations from Nahshon to David, (406 years for four generations) is happily abbreviated to a nearer conformity with nature, by adding one descent:

III. RACHAB the mother of Boaz, if she be supposed the same who entertained the spies, (which the Evangelist doth not affirm), must have been either superannuated or dead before the time of his birth. But if his mother were a descendant from, or a kinswoman, of the first Rachab, in the transverse line, the difficulty is surmounted; and this first Rachab might have been the wife of Salmah, and that marriage celebrated soon after the passage over Jordan.

IV. BY this distinction, David is the 14th in descent
from

from Abraham, exclusively, in perfect agreement with the decisive report of Matt. i. 17.

Objections.

1. *The text in Ruth is a single authority, and contradictory to all the subsequent registers, particularly to that in the first chapter of the gospel by Matthew.*

Answer. THE position is inapposite, and the inference inconsequential. Sundry important notations depend on the authority of one solitary text ; for instance, the specification of 480 years for the interval from the egress to the fourth year of Solomon. This space is much too long for four generations from Nahshon, on the common supposition that Nahshon was cut off in the wilderness, that Salmon, who married Rachab, was his immediate son, and that this Rachab was the mother of Boaz by Salmon. But insert Salmah, the computation is brought within the limits of physical probability. It involves no absurdity to conjecture, that *Salmah* was omitted in the other registers, as is Salmon in 1 Chron. ii. 12. As to the catalogue in the first chapter of Matthew, before the omission can be allowed to have any force, it ought to be certified, that the names Ahazias, Joaz, and Amazias, were at any time found in any one copy. If they were, that one copy has unhappily eluded the industry of Mill, Kuster, Wetstein, and Bowyer. These three names occur in all the Old Testament pedigrees, and as essential parts of Matthew's roll, are here restored. In all the records the
loss

loss or change of names might naturally proceed from the same cause. A copyist with the fullest intention of executing an accurate transcript, directing his eye from Ohozias, Matt. i. 8. ; after engrossing this word in his parchment, might, on returning to the volume, find Ozias, and misled by the similitude of words, leave out the intermediate clauses, and so retrench three generations from the catalogue. In the like manner might one copyist of the first book of Chronicles omit *Salmon* ; and another overlook *Salmah* in Matthew. The original text, in Ruth, seems to have been read thus : “ Nahshon begat Salmah, and Salmah begat Salmon, and Salmon begat Boaz,” &c.

2. *It may be objected, that most of the ancient and modern versions of Ruth leave out Salmah.*

It is replied, that this is true with respect to the Septuagint, and may also hold with respect to others. But versions may uniformly be erroneous, and can merit no credit in opposition to the original text, as often as it exactly harmonises with the truth of chronology, history, and nature ; which is the case with the text under review.

3. *The admittance of SALMAH into the Evangelist's roll renders impracticable a hint formerly suggested, intimating the possibility of restoring to Matthew's catalogue the names of Jehoiakim and Ahaziah.*

Answer. THIS objection is, in its utmost force, admitted. But it must be recollected, that the former computation, framed on the vulgar system, presupposes that the names of Abraham and Jesus Christ are neces-

fary to complete the register of thrice XIV. generations. This NEW SCHEME excludes both, under the notion of implying a palpable absurdity. Jehoiakim is extant in the roll, under the equivalent name of the first Jeconias; the difference being no more than a variation of dialect.

THE only question now remaining for a solution is, Whether ought Salmah or Ahaziah to be admitted? If both be received, the list is redundant; but deficient, if both be left out. To preserve every criterion of congruity between the genealogical registers of the Old and New Testament, with respect to chronology, history, nature, and the proper distribution of the triple series, into three equal parts, Salmah has every claim to the preference.

IN the case of Ahaziah, it has above been suggested, that his son Joash was born in the very year of his grandfather Jehoram's demise; and that, should his immediate father, Ahaziah, be omitted in the catalogue of descents, no blank in time would be the result; and though the Evangelist, most probably, inserted his name, yet left this discovery in computation to the sagacity of his readers;—a point now no less obvious, than that Abraham and Jesus Christ are not comprehended in the intermediate generations; that it is requisite to include Salmah in the first series, to the end that it may terminate in David; that Joash and Amaziah were transcribed into the original roll from the chronicle of the kings in the second series; and that the third properly
begins

begins with Jofiah, and ends with Jacob, Joseph of Nazareth's father *.

THIS cautious and well-meant attempt to reconcile the sacred genealogies with truth and nature, was neither undertaken, nor conducted, with the view of recommending the correction of the inspired oracles, in the original text of either Testament ;—a power which it is supposed no particular Christian church will, in this age of the world, assume or execute. The author's sanguine wish is to suggest a few hints, for the use of the sacred order, in their endeavours to elucidate the Bible from the pulpit or the press. This invaluable code of divine knowledge, after every effort to unfold its precious contents, still continues, in many respects, a sealed book to many of its readers.

* Unwilling to incur the imputation of rashness, in adding a new name to the register, the author has affixed to Salmah no number, while Ahaziah is marked as the 6th in the second series. Those judicious readers who acknowledge the force of the four reasons alleged in favour of Salmah, p. 296, are left at liberty to prefix the number 9 to his name, and to expunge 6 before Ahaziah. By the arrangement here proposed, necessary it was to restore four names from the Hebrew records ; but omitted by the Evangelist. Ahaziah, it has been shewn, *must* be included in the list of kings, but *may* be omitted in the line of Christ's progenitors, because the tale of intermediate years is the same, and the *genealogy complete*.

C H A P. VIII.

Luke's Edition of the Genealogies.

THE differences arising from the two registers have employed so many pens, that even an abstract of the opinions, adopted by several authors, would fill a volume. The reader who desires to see them, must apply to their works, of which he may find a large catalogue in Poole's Synopsis, or in Barradius's Commentary. Those who would take a cursory view of this subject, may derive much satisfaction from a treatise, of which the title is expressed in the note *.

THE former Evangelist, it is commonly said, wrote his gospel for confirming the faith of the believing Jews; this for the information of the converts from paganism; and each constructed his catalogue suitably to his ultimate design; the one tracing Christ's pedigree from the father of the twelve tribes, the other

* *La Genealogie de Jesus Christ; avec demelement des Difficultes qui se rencontrent dans cette Genealogie, par M. Guillard.* Leyd. 1683. See Pilkington's Notes on the Evangel. History, § 14.; also Grotius, South's Sermons, vol. iii. Trapp, Yardley, Berriman, above quoted,

from

from the first progenitor of mankind. The final result is conviction, the method pursued dissimilar, but the accounts not contradictory; and the number of generations, though unequal, yet exempt from the suspicion of fallacy. The Jews were in possession of a regular history, from the time they became a distinct people; and, therefore, Matthew adopted the *descending* series from their first settlement in Canaan, to the then passing age. But as the Gentiles had no records of equal authenticity, and no certain knowledge of the earliest times, Luke began with the most recent period of tradition, and thence proceeded from stage to stage, in the *ascending* series, to that point, beyond which the computation by historical years, and by generations, cannot be continued.

THE rolls from Adam to David agree in the names with no variation, but such as results from the difference of languages and dialects. The number too is the same, with one sole exception, that of

1. *The second Cainan.*

ON the authority of this Evangelist, supported by that of the Greek Pentateuch, has the existence of this spurious patriarch been generally believed in the Christian church, from the fourth to the now expiring century. So inveterate is this persuasion, so many and pertinacious its advocates, that those who suspect an interpolation almost incur the uncharitable suspicion of heresy. After a brief history of this controversy, Shuckford expresses his conviction, that the name is surreptitious.

surreptitious. His decision, with the reasons for it, is here transcribed, as the most probable, perspicuous, and concise.

“ EUSEBIUS and Africanus, both of them, besides other writers, took their accounts of those times from the LXX., and yet have no such person, as Cainan, among the post-diluvians. 2. They did not admit his name from carelessness, for by the number of generations and of years, which they compute from Shem to Abraham, it is plain they knew of no other name than they have given us ; therefore, 3. The ancient copies of the Septuagint, from which Africanus and Eusebius wrote, had not the name of Cainan *. 4. This name
came

* This position is controvertible, if not false. More probable it is, that both these fathers found this name in their copies of the Gr. Pentateuch, but, suspecting it to be interpolated, would not mention it on authority so very equivocal. It certainly was extant in that version, long before the Christian era. For Yardley, who contends that the name is genuine, quotes the same Eusebius, who has preserved a fragment of Alex. Corn. Polyhistor, 86 years before Christ. The passage was copied by Polyhistor, from Demetrius the historian, who flourished 170 years before the Christian era, and is to this effect : “ From Adam to the time when Joseph's relations went down into Egypt, are 3624 years.” Yardley remarks ; “ From which fragment it plainly appears, 1. That Demetrius follows the chronology of the LXX. 2. That their chronology was, at *that time*, (within about 70 years after this version was first made), the very same that it now appears to be : and 3. That Demetrius doth, and the LXX. interpreters then did, include this second Cainan, and insert the years to him appertaining. For without these years, the foresaid calculation will fall short
exactly

came into the Septuagint copies, through the carelessness of some transcriber, who from inattention inserted an ante-diluvian name, (for such a person *was* before the flood), among the post-diluvians, and having no numbers for his name, wrote the numbers belonging to Salah twice over. 5. Other copies being taken from that erroneous one, the name of Cainan in time came to be generally inserted. 6. St. Luke did not put Cainan into his genealogy; but, 7. Learned men finding it in the Septuagint, and not in this gospel, some transcribers marked in the margin of their copies this name, as thinking it an omission. 8. Later copiers and editors, finding it thus in the margin, took it into the text *."

FROM the post-diluvian genealogy this second Cainan is excluded by the Samaritan copy. Josephus was extremely cautious of giving a spurious patriarch a place in the Hebrew register, and, from this principle, would not admit Cainan as a son of Arphaxad. But, after very solemn protestations of translating from the sacred records, he adopted the enormously magnified numbers of the Greek chronology, and, without hesitation, added to the age of about 15 fathers, at the birth of their specified sons, 100 years, and thus en-

exactly 130 years." Genealogy, p. 118. Dr. Winder affirms that the amplified chronology of the Gr. Pent. was coeval with the first formation of that version, in the time of Ptolemy by the translators. Hist. of Knowl. Part i. p. 240.

* Connex. vol. i. p. 280.

larged

larged the period from Adam to Abraham, about 15 centuries, and evinced his unfaithfulness as a translator.

THE writers of the Samaritan copy, the translators of the Greek version, and Josephus, all impelled by a partiality in favour of an incredible antiquity, to which Moses made no claim, are inconsistent with one another, and with themselves, in many notations of time. The Hebrew Pentateuch, whence all the others were professedly taken, either as transcripts, or versions, agrees in all its copies, as well those now extant, as others of which any fragments or quotations occur in history. In computation it is an infallible axiom, that an original deed, or which is equivalent, numerous copies of it, taken at diverse times, and all in perfect concord, without the least variation of numbers, are of preferable credit to translations, justly suspected of wilful corruption, to gratify national pride.

WITH the Christian fathers the Greek version had obtained all the regard and authority, due to the venerable original, with which many of them were but very little acquainted. They propagated a malicious clamour against the Jews, as if they had, by general consent, abbreviated the primitive Mosaical chronology, in order to elude the predictions relative to the time of the Messiah's appearance, and to perplex computation.

BEFORE the final overthrow of the temple a fraud of this magnitude was impracticable, and since the general dispersion, physically impossible. As if the affirmative had been fully proved, with all the specialities of time, place, persons, and circumstances, the cla-

mour has of late been renewed by Whiston, Jackson, Kennicott; and last of all by Dr. L. Geddes, who in an English version of the Pentateuch, inserts the spurious Cainan, and introduces into the xith chapter of Genesis all the exaggerated numbers of the Alexandrian interpreters, under the equally audacious and false pretence of translating from a correct copy of the original; and lest he should incur the suspicion of believing the divine authority of the sacred text, scruples not to repeat his professions, that he does not suppose Moses to have written under the influence of inspiration.

DR. Winder, in the passage above quoted, suggests a very forcible reason for the opinion, that the Hebrew chronology was not abbreviated by the Jews, but enlarged by the first Greek translators;—"because the latter had a visible end to be answered by it; viz. that of magnifying their antiquities according to the humour of that age; and when there was scarce any danger of detection:—greater, I say, was the probability of corrupting the Greek version, than of altering the Hebrew text, at a time when it could answer no end, against either Christians or Pagans; and when it would be almost impossible to escape the detection of the Christian critics, who were NOW * as much concerned as the Jews themselves to study the Hebrew.

2. *Harmony*

* NOW the author must refer to the second century of the Christian era, when Whiston wildly surmises that the Jews mutilated the chronology of their Pentateuch. As if the fact
had

2. *Harmony of the Genealogies from Arphaxad to Nathan.*

NOT only in the two Evangelists, but in the Septuagint version, the Samaritan copy, and Josephus, are the names of the descendants from Shem, and the sum
of

had been fully proved by direct historical evidence, Jackson and Kennicott revived the slanderous calumny against the Jews of that age; and, in this paragraph, Winder vindicates them from that aspersion, on the great improbability of the attempt, and the certainty of detection. Whatever characteristical blemishes stain the reputation of that infatuated people, invariably zealous they always were to preserve the purity of their sacred code. In this respect they exactly resemble the practice of the modern Romish church, which has preserved inviolate the original text; but pronounced one of its ancient versions equal in authority. Thus the Jews kept their records unvitiated, but preferred the less certain guidance of oral tradition; and the Romanists, in a less remote period, followed their example. Neither party suspected, that though they faithfully performed the office of DEPOSITARIES, yet they kept in safe custody the sure evidences, that the one had grossly corrupted Judaism, the other Christianity: and both, like the wicked and slothful servant, who hid his Lord's talent in a napkin, are judged out of their own mouths.

The author alludes to an age, when it was the humour to magnify the antiquity of nations. It first prevailed in Egypt, the very region where the Greek version of the Pentateuch was fabricated, and subsequent to the time of Herodotus, whom the national priests had misled by exaggerated traditions of a very remote origin, unsupported by historical records. Manetho and Eratosthenes in the same century gave a fresh impulse to the vanity of a credulous age; and the Alexandrian

of generations the same, down to the nativity of Abraham, Cainan excepted. Hence to the demise of David the evangelical pedigrees agree with the Hebrew records, and with one another.

3. *Variations from David to Zorobabel.*

“THAT the difference in the two pedigrees is owing to the different methods in which they are deduced, and not to want of truth in either, may be argued on the following accounts. 1. Because the Jews allowed the main point, that Jesus was of David’s family ; so that the Evangelist had no need of invention or artifice to prove it. 2. Had they designed to falsify, they would have avoided all variation as much as possible, and delivered their account with the greatest appearance of consistency. So that their very variation is a proof of their simplicity and freedom from any design of combination or imposture. These considerations are of greater weight to defend the integrity of the Evangelists, and our Lord’s pedigree from David, than

interpreters, to protect the Jews from the supposed infamy of an upstart race, enlarged the genealogical numbers of Moses, in their new version, but suffered the genuine notation, which remain at this day, to continue as they found them. This criticism supercedes Shuckford’s fourth remark, that Cainan’s name was first introduced by the negligence of a transcriber, posterior to the first formation of the Gr. Pent. For if the numbers were then first enlarged to falsify the chronology, needless it is to connect with a less recent date the interpolation of a spurious patriarch, which fallacious artifice adds 130 years to the chronology of that period.

the difference, observed between them, can be to overthrow it, even though we were not able to conjecture the reason of such difference."

"BUT to come nearer to the point, we are not without all conjecture, what different methods the Evangelists might use, in their deduction of the pedigree, which might lead them into this variety;" (nay render it unavoidable): "so that, though their accounts are not perfectly the same, yet both may be true, and both consistent: and, though we cannot demonstrate, after all, that our account is certainly right, yet it is enough for the part of a respondent, that it may be so, for ought we know to the contrary. This effectually takes off the force of the objection; so that nothing can be concluded against us from the appearing variety. Two schemes principally have been offered for the reconciliation of this difficulty." "The first is that of Julius Africanus, in the beginning of the third century, and whose notion, in this matter, is both stated and approved by Eusebius;—that the two Evangelists have drawn out the pedigree of Joseph, in two different views, the *natural* and *legal* method."

"THE second scheme of reconciliation is,—that Matthew has given us the pedigree of Joseph, and Luke that of Mary; that so, from both Evangelists together, we might have a double pedigree from David, the one in the line by Solomon, the other by the line of Nathan*."

* Berriman's Sermons, vol. i. serm. v. p. 125, &c.

THIS judicious writer sets forth the merits of either scheme, the objections to each, with the answers, and affirms the propriety of both. In an *Analysis*, a more minute discussion is needless.

THE generations in Matthew from David to Abiud, excluding both, as likewise Ahaziah, are 19, as before stated, and the mean proportion of time cannot be ascertained, because the interval from the birth of Jeconiah to Abiud is not known. If Zorobabel with his father Salathiel be omitted, the descents are 17, ending with the year of Jehoiachin's captivity, A. M. 3410. Let the year of Solomon's birth, in 2971, be the source of computation: then the less number, deducted from the greater, leaves 428; and this sum, divided by 17, quotes 25 years two months for the common interval.

IN Luke's catalogue, from David to Neri, in the line of Nathan, are 20 generations. But it merits enquiry whether a deduction be not admissible. Irenæus, Africanus, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerom, Augustin, and, on their authority, Grotius, with several other modern critics, reject Levi and Matthat*. Some of those fathers it seems surmised, that 72 new languages were framed at the confusion of tongues, and that this number was equal to the generations from Adam to Christ. This is a fanciful association. It is however said, that they, on this notion, expunged from the register Levi and Matthat, together with Cainan. A

* Luke, iii. 24.

much better reason occurs. Fully were they persuaded, that none of all the three names had a place in the Evangelist's autograph, or in its earliest transcripts. In the days of Irenæus all three began to appear. He and others rejected them as spurious. But as it was, in that age, a vulgar prejudice, that the new tongues, which originated from Babel, and the progenitors of Jesus Christ, were equal in number, those who did not *assent* to this notion, might by that mode of reasoning, called *argumentum ad hominem*, declare their *dissent* from the reception of Cainan, Levi, and Matthat, into the list. Cainan belongs to a former class, and is already reprobated. But Neri, as the last of this series, may, by a former rule, be left out: and thus the generations in private life, are, for the same period, equal to those in the royal calendar from David, that is, 17 descents in 428 years.

4. *Variations from Zerobabel to Joseph and Mary.*

IN this, as in the foregoing section, the names are entirely different; but the subject of discussion is the variation of generations, with respect to number, in the same period of time.

MATTHEW's register exhibits 12 generations from Jeconiah to Jacob, the father of Joseph. From the historical year of the incarnation, A. M. 4004 *, deduct the year of Jeconiah's birth, 3392, the difference is 612. This sum divided by 12, the common quantity

* The number is properly expressed, for Usher gives 4000, the vulgar reckoning 4008. The historical year is 4004.

of a generation is precisely 51. This mediate space exceeds the descents from kings; though, in the former series by kings and private families, the proportion was equality.

IN the roll by Luke, from Jeconiah to Heli, the mother of Mary, are 21 generations; by which sum divide 612, the mean proportion is 29. Sometimes one life is the double of two in co-existence and succession; sometimes two generations are equal to three in a series. The difference here is very considerable.

“ IT is no wonder, or any reasonable objection, that variation, or seeming inconsistency, should be in the account of our Lord’s genealogy, by the two Evangelists. Those, who are acquainted with the customs of the Jews know, that many genealogies seem repugnant, and are not so. That may happen various ways, as may easily be proved from several books, which the Jews and we jointly acknowledge. Besides, several are the methods of reconciling these difficulties, though it is sometimes hard to say which is the best, at the distance of so many ages; all memory, and even records of these things, being utterly lost.* * * Were the particular difficulties more and greater than they are, one general answer would be sufficient. Had this genealogy, as drawn by the two Evangelists, been false or inconsistent, in any one instance, the Jews, who were
then

then living, when the gospels were published, could not but know it; and, being mortal enemies to Christianity, could not but expose it to all the world: and this must have utterly ruined the credit of both these gospels; which we know is not the case *."

BETWEEN Moses and the Evangelists is a striking similarity of manner in their common character, as historiographers. He wrote such strange accounts of strange things, as were not likely to obtain credit, the production of a universe from nothing, the destruction of the whole earth by a deluge, with the exception of a small flock, for the restoration of mankind, and animals of every species. They reported the birth of a son by a virgin mother, and the redemption of mankind by his death on a cross, which doctrine some accounted foolishness, and was to others a stumbling block. Neither he nor they betrayed the least suspicion that they might incur the censure of collecting and transmitting a mass of absurd paradoxes, impossibilities, contradictions. No apology they offered for the seemingly incredible things they recommended to the belief of the world; no anxiety did they discover about consequences, with respect to themselves; yet with an ardour of charity and zeal, with all the powers of persuasion, did they beseech, implore, and intreat, those to whom they were sent, to consult their own most important interests. Here is every criterion of knowledge and veracity, of

* Trapp's Notes on Matt. i. 1—13.

a sober mind, and of superiority to popular opinion. These Evangelists did not mean to contradict one another; each had a distinct part of the same subject; and both, [Matthew and Luke], it must be presumed, executed their design with all the precision, required in faithful historians *.

* The Jews, in common with the Christians, hold, that the Messiah was to proceed from David; and what objection was more pertinent than THIS, that though the apostles did preach the natural descent of Jesus from David, yet as he had no earthly father, they did not give a true and regular genealogy from David to Mary. This objection would have been much more forcible, than those many trifling cavils, which the modern Jews have brought, or their forefathers had alleged against the truth of the gospel. To obviate this objection, after Matthew had given the natural descent of Joseph from Abraham; the Holy Spirit directed the pen of Luke to record the genealogy of Heli, the father of Mary, the mother of Jesus, from David, the king, from Abraham, the father of the Hebrews, and from Adam, the father of all mankind. See Yardley on the Genealogies, page 353, &c.

A P P E N D I X.

A P P E N D I X.

Strictures on Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology.

INTRODUCTION.

THIS prodigy of genius, while exploring the laws of nature, devoted occasionally a vacant hour to the history of time, with the measures of which he was well acquainted ; and in such researches, intricate as is the subject, found relief from the fatigue of investigating those general principles, which pervade the still more complex mechanism of the universe.

“ He bound the sun
And planets to their spheres ! th’ unequal task
Of human kind till then. Oft had they roll’d
O’er erring man the year, and oft disgrac’d
The pride of schools, before their course was known
Full in its causes and effects to him,
All piercing sage ! who sat not down and dream’d
Romantic schemes, defended by the din
Of specious words and tyranny of names ;
But, bidding his amazed mind attend,

And

And with heroick patience years on years
 Deep-searching, saw at last the system dawn
 And shine of all his race, on him alone.
 The noiseless *tide* of *time*, all bearing down
 To vast eternity's unbounded sea,
 Where the green islands of the happy shine,
 He stemm'd alone; and to the source (involv'd
 Deep in primeval gloom) ascending rais'd
 His lights at equal distances, to guide
 Historian, wilder'd on his darksome way."

THIS elegant encomium * is, with one exception, just. Even the vast, capacious mind of Newton did not ascend to the *source* of *time*, but left it *involved in deep primeval gloom*. From the vulgar year of the nativity, as erroneously defined by Usher, A. P. J. 4709, (which is the true historical date), he pursues his researches, in the retrograde order, to the days of Eli, where he states the first synchronism of the Egyptian history with that of the Hebrews.

MUCH is it regretted, that he did not extend the line of investigation through the patriarchal ages, by the notations of an infallible chronology, (which happily combines GENEALOGY with HISTORY), back to the origin of things,—that point in measured time where genuine history begins, and beyond which chronology can go no farther. Not suspecting deception or error in the lucubrations of a metropolitan, who was

* Thomson's Poem to the Memory of Sir Isaac Newton.

the ornament of his age, and had excelled all his predecessors in the singular art of HISTORICAL ARRANGEMENT, Sir Isaac stopt short, and excluded from his system the chronology of 28 centuries.

IN Sir John Marsham's Chronological Canon, this adventurous reformer of ancient computations found a rich mine of mixed ore, gold, silver, brass, iron, and clay; all in one mass; waiting the refiner's skill, and the operations of the furnace. Hence he derived an immense variety of materials, susceptible of a better arrangement, and a more perfect form. The result of a minute examination was a full conviction, that the antiquities of the Gentiles had been amplified by fiction, disguised under the mask of allegory, and derived belief from the credulity of an ignorant world.

THE CHRONOLOGY *of ancient* KINGDOMS *amended*, was not an attempt rashly projected, or its ingredients precipitately thrown together. About five months before the author's death he had an interview with Dr. Pearce, late bishop of Rochester, whom he informed, "That he had spent thirty years, at intervals, in reading over all the authors, or parts of authors, which could furnish any materials, for forming a just account of the Ancient Chronology;—that he had, in his reading, made collections from those authors, and had, at the end of 30 years, composed from thence HIS Chronology of ancient Kingdoms;—and that he had written it over several times, (it appeared afterwards, the bishop thought 16 times), making a few alterations in it, but what were for the sake of shortening

ening it (as the bishop gathered from his discourse), and leaving out, in every later copy, some of the authorities and references, on which he had grounded his opinions."

As this elaborate work was begun in the vigour of his faculties, so it was the subject of his thoughts, and the exercise of his hand, in the last period of his life. "A few days before he died, Dr. Pearce made him a visit at Kensington, and dined with him. He found him writing over his *Chronology of ancient Kingdoms*, without the help of spectacles, at the greatest distance in the room from the windows, and with a parcel of books on the table casting a shade upon the paper. Seeing this, on my entering the room, (said the doctor), "Sir, you seem to be writing in a place where you cannot well see." His answer was, "Little light serves me." He then told me, that he was preparing his *Chronology* for the press, and that he had written the greatest part of it for that purpose*."

WITH many disadvantages, the almost unavoidable fate of posthumous works, this last and least perfect production of the venerable Sir Isaac Newton, was ushered into the world†. His work, as it is, has so
great

* Bishop Pearce's Life, prefixed to his Commentary on the Gospels, &c. p. 42—44.

† Buchanan's History, without the benefit of his last revival, appeared about three weeks before his death, and he had the mortification to be told, that the printer had committed many egregious mistakes. Maclaurin dying with the pen in his hand, before he had finished his ACCOUNT of SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S

great merit, that, with all its faults, no one publication on the subject contains so many valuable improvements. Perfection is a character incompatible with the most finished productions of human genius. Its principles new, bold, and rather deep than dark, amazed the illiterate, and puzzled the learned. Scarcely could it be expected, that even the most accurate practitioners, in the computation of TIMES, would instantly renounce the authority of hoary tradition, abjure tenets established by immemorial belief, and become profelytes to a system, incongruous with the prejudices of education, and constitutional habits of thinking.

The Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended, having divided the opinions of the best judges, experienced a kind of ambiguous reception. Its fate was neither that of many fungous productions ;—a premature death in infancy ;—the last, and not least severe, curse of unsuccessful authorship : nor summary reprobation on the score of literary imposture. In the very year of its publication, 1728, Bedford sent forth his ANIMADVERSIONS, and Whiston his CONFUTATION. These luminaries of their day elucidated several obscure parts of an abstruse subject. In their distinct performances are obvious signatures of erudition, acuteness, and candour, without credulity, adulation, sarcasm, and illi-

NEWTON's *Philosophical Discoveries*, this work concludes with three asterics, to denote imperfection. With a similar fatality was his own Chronology exhibited to the public ;—a part not copied by the author, and the whole sent forth in the condition of a defenceless orphan.

beral

beral abuse. With the progress of TIME, Sir Isaac Newton's antagonists multiplied.

So early as 1730, Shuckford in the Preface to his third volume of *Historical Connexions*, revived and strengthened the objection of the two authors, now mentioned, to Sir Isaac's *Astronomical Argument*, for bringing the date of the *Argonautic Expedition* three centuries lower than it had been settled by the *Old Chronology*; and, it must be confessed, left the great author's postulate and conclusion, under all the disadvantages (with respect to credibility), of scientific conjecture.

SQUIRE, in his *Defence of the Ancient Greek Chronology*, 1741, repeated the impulse on the mind of the public, and struck a deeper impression. It is there affirmed, that Chiron was no practical astronomer;—that he had not sufficient knowledge to mark out and distinguish the constellations in the zodiac from those in the other parts of the heavens;—that though his skill had been equal to the construction of an exact sphere, and for assigning to the equinoctial and solstitial points their *proper* places; yet such a sphere could not be of the least use to the Argonauts, in their short voyage from Thessaly to Colchis.

COSTARD, in his Letter to Sir Martin Folkes, on the *Rise and Progress of ASTRONOMY* among the Ancients, 1746, obliquely, yet with becoming decorum, reprehends this *Astronomical Argument*, while he respectfully conceals the author's name. “Some persons, too great to be mentioned without reverence, suppose, that
he

he [Chiron] formed the constellations for the use of the Argonauts. If, as it seems, he meant all those mentioned in the sphere of Eudoxus, it is more, I am afraid, than can well be allowed. That he might be an OBSERVER, indeed, is not improbable, being contemporary with those who were so :”—Palamedes, Astræus, Nauplius, Atlas, &c. before mentioned.

THE last, but not the least successful, opponent to Sir Isaac's positions, concerning the *Greek Chronology*, is Dr. Musgrave in his EXAMINATION of the Objections to the Chronology of the OLYMPIADS, in 1772: to all which authors the inquisitive and learned reader is referred, for more ample information.

SOME principles in this very respectable philosopher's last, though least perfect work, at variance with those of a late right reverend divine, are combated, in the third volume of his Divine Legation, from p. 242 to 342, with less delicacy than zeal. Warburton was not a match for Newton in those parts of literature connected with the arts of calculation; but by an inherent vigour of genius, brought discredit on some of that illustrious author's conclusions, in his book of Chronological Emendations. Hooke, in the introduction to his *Roman History*, undertakes a vindication of Sir Isaac's arrangements from the objections of his several opponents, and after making several concessions, particularly the juniority of Rome with respect to Carthage, concludes in favour of the reformed chronology.

SIR Isaac Newton's amazing discoveries in the application of geometry and experimental philosophy to the system of nature, his ingenious Theory of Light and Colours, his Improvements in Universal Arithmetic, not to mention his very probable claim to the Invention of Fluxions, had, in his lifetime, procured him universal estimation, as the model of scientific perfection ; and he was almost the singular example of genius having surmounted envy before death. But with slow caution, and not without numerous abatements and mortifying reservations, have the merits of his two last publications, *Observations upon the Prophecies*, and *The Chronology of ancient Kingdoms*, both posthumous, been admitted ; though he had the felicity not only to improve, but adorn, every subject, to which he applied his masterly talents.

IN each of these performances candid criticism must allow certain objections, stated by several learned men, to remain, either in part, or in their full force. But this concession does not divest that great man of the honours unquestionably due to him, on account of his happy elucidation of the prophetic style ; and of his connecting a train of particular predictions, with the continuous series of genuine history ;—neither of many important discoveries, the result of astronomy, chronology, and genealogy, applied with exquisite skill, and wonderful harmony of co-operation and effect, to the history of the EARLY AGES. Imperfection is inseparable from even the most elaborate productions of human
man

man genius. When the intricacy of the subject is considered, the oversights here are few and excusable *.

IN framing the prefixed ANALYSIS, several instances of defect in the plan, and of improper disposition in the order of the *NEWTONIAN Chronology* have occurred. These, not altogether excluding characters of imperfection or excellence, observed by other writers on the subject, are the ground-work of this APPENDIX, which is, for this reason, divided into two parts.

* “ I have one general remark to make on Sir Isaac’s book; that he finds fault with the earlier part of the Grecian history for having no chronology; and yet supposes, that when chronology, that is, technical chronology, was introduced by Timæus and others, the only use made of it was to falsify their history. This makes it necessary to explain, in a few words, my notion what chronology is, and what it is not. I say then, that the genealogy of a particular family, a series of kings or priestesses, a list of archons, or the records of a public solemnity, like the olympic games; none of these are chronology. But chronology is that science, which compares those lists, genealogies, and records together, and adjusts them to one another, making, if possible, one consistent whole. This is a work that requires, no doubt, the hand of a master, and it requires also an unprejudiced mind. For if the chronologer has any favourite point to establish, if, for instance, he be desirous of extending or contracting any particular period, he will be tempted to mutilate or stretch them out, as may best serve his purpose. The want of chronology with which Sir Isaac reproaches the Greeks, is a circumstance, which in another point of view may be considered as strongly supporting their credit.”
—Mufgrave, p. 224.

C H A P. I.

Sir ISAAC NEWTON's Chronology.

IN computing TIMES, Dodwell assumes, as fundamental, a reasonable postulate, “The Chronologer must proceed from known to less certain periods *.” The primary term in computation, depending, as suggested in the subjoined note, on the quantity of measured time, from the first to the second Adam, and defined in the records, which Jews and Christians acknowledge to be of divine authority, merits the highest

* A certioribus temporibus ad incertiora progrediendum. *Dissertationes de Græcorum Romanorumque Cyclis.* The times with which the New Testament history begins are no less known from authentic records, than those of the subsequent ages. Kennedy reverses the postulate, “Tempora quò antiquiora, eo certiora. This position is applicable to that period alone, with which the Old Testament history begins. The great difficulty, which has not heretofore been surmounted, is by comparing with itself, by the aid of borrowed light, the sacred history, for the intermediate space from the CREATION to the CHRISTIAN ERA. To fix the astronomical years, so as not to count incomplete for full, or to multiply their number by counting full years twice, has been attempted in the *Introduction* to the foregoing *Analysis*.

degree

degree of credit, because the vouchers, whence it is ascertained, are, of all others, the best attested, and the term, as in them, fixed most consonant with natural phenomena, the late origin of the most ancient civil establishments and national records, the slow progress, and continual improvements in arts, &c. Suppose this term uncertain, and these vouchers counterfeit, curious and skilful enquirers into the origin of HISTORICAL TIME are left in perplexity to determine whether the Mosaical chronology, or that of the Chaldees, Chinese, Egyptians, Gentoos, &c. merits the preference.

EVERY well informed and impartial enquirer must admit, that the Hebrew records, inspiration apart, are recommended by internal characters of consistency, method, order, and truth; not to be found in the annals of nations, who pretended a prior origin to the Hebrews, but were certainly much more recent. No alphabetical composition, on any subject, in the primitive language of Egypt, is mentioned in any old historian, even by its title, or a detached fragment. The Coptic alphabet is demonstratively, if not confessedly, modern. Manetho's Dynasties, originally the result of fiction and forgery, never had the lowest claim to credibility: and so much are they disfigured by deliberate changes of names, order, numbers, enlarged, omitted, mutilated, or transposed, that no guess can be made concerning their primitive contents or form. The Bible exhibiting every criterion of plan, method, and tendency to an ultimate end, is properly the subject of fair criticism, and never loses credibility, but always

acquires consistence, certainty, and every infallible character of truth, from those modes of trial, and tests of authenticity, which never fail to detect the fabrications of imposture.

SIR Isaac Newton, having built his Chronology on a foundation already laid, the ANNALS of Archbishop Usher, which had, before his time, obtained a general reception, went no farther back than the days of Eli, 28 full centuries subsequent to the Mosaical creation. But, as he did not avow his approbation of the received system, nobody knows, though it cannot reasonably be presumed, whether he did tacitly adopt the amplified antiquities of the Gentiles. The very first sentence of his work removes all such suspicion : “ All nations, before they began to keep exact accounts of time, have been prone to raise their antiquities ; and this humour has been promoted between nations about their originals.”

FARTHER, the Chronology of the Hebrew Pentateuch is, in many instances, different from that of the Samaritan copy, of the Greek version, and of Josephus. In several copies these distinct authorities contradict one another, and all deviate from the original, which in all its transcripts, the Samaritan excepted, exhibits everywhere the same notations of number within the expressed period. Here are two reasons of preference, originality, and self consistence. Transcripts and versions are tried by their antitypes, as the supreme standard. Conformity is rectitude, and deviation the creature of error or unfaithfulness. Well known are the
agents,

agents, the times, and the probable causes of variation from the numbers of the venerable original, which none of the scribes or translators had the effrontery to corrupt. As they found, they left it—unvitiating by enlargement, mutilation, or change; and kept in custody the precious depositum, which eventually detected their breach of fidelity, as copiers or translators.

THE impulsive cause of amplifying the true Moisaical computation was to rescue the nation of the Hebrews from the supposed ignominy of a recent origin, in compliance with the prevalent vanity of the Gentiles from the days of Herodotus to those of Josephus. It has been alleged that the Jews of the second century first abbreviated their chronology. This conjecture has already been obviated, by shewing the impossibility of such a fraud from the time of Moses to the Christian era; greater still was the difficulty of executing such a project, at a later period; for the Christians of the first century had got in possession the genuine oracles of inspiration.

THIS illustrious reformer of ancient chronology, taking his rise from the times of the later judges in Israel, has left it doubtful what edition of the Heb. Pentateuch he approved, whether the original text, or its transcripts and versions, as the model of true chronology. The numbers marked in the *Short Chronicle* express the years before the Christian era, as fixed by Usher. Where he is erroneous, and Sir Isaac's arrangements did not require a different date, he erred with his master; whence it is presumed, that his prime source

of computation is the number of the Julian Period 4710.

WERE this computation accurate, which it is not, Usher antedates the dispersion by a term of years, which affects the credibility of Moses in his historical character, if the state of arts and population, at the close of the first century after the flood, be maturely considered. The interval, compressed within too narrow limits, violates physical probability. Moses affirms, that, "in the days of Peleg was the earth divided." Usher, after Josephus, refers that partition to the very year of that patriarch's birth. But the sacred historian's words may fairly be supposed applicable to any year of Peleg's life, whose age at death was 239 ; or to any year before the birth of Haran, (a brother of Abram), of whom it is recorded that he died in the land of his nativity. This notation of time presupposes the division of the earth. Who so well qualified to rectify this obvious prochronism as the renowned Sir Isaac Newton, whose powers of computation seem to have been intuitive? This point, the time of the general dispersion, would have opened to his view momentous discoveries, respecting the plantation of the first colonies, and the rise of the most ancient kingdoms. It would likewise have prevented the confusion, which, since his death, perplexes this subject, and is likely not to be soon removed. The authors of the *Ancient Universal History*, puzzled with the difficulties attending this period of the sacred chronology, and incapable of dispelling the darkness induced by the frivolous and false arrangements of inexperienced

7

chronologers

chronologers and commentators, preferred the computations of the Samaritan copy, as more expanded than those of the Hebrew, and less extravagant than those of the Greek version. Nor has the licentiousness of innovation stopt here. Whiston, Hay, Jackson, and Kennicott, having revived the credit of the once exploded Septuagint, it is now the supreme and exclusive chronological directory; for one Geddes, in compliance with general opinion, has lately introduced into the English Pentateuch, the genealogical numbers in Gen. xi. from the Alexandrian interpreters, under the false pretence of translating from the Hebrew.

EVEN among those Christian writers, who adhere to the Hebrew computation, great is the discord of opinions, concerning the first point in time, which era Strauchius pronounces the gordian knot in chronology, never to be untwisted by the ingenuity of man. Petavius, Wallis, and others, have been so bold as to affirm that absolute certainty in this matter is not attainable, but by divine revelation.

UNREASONABLE it is to expect an immediate communication of supernatural light, to confirm the discoveries of the written word. If this point be not there revealed, it may safely be avoided, as one of those foolish and unlearned questions, which minister strifes, rather than promote edification. David Paræus, as quoted by Usher, pronounced those (who promised an exact astronomical table of time, from the first point of the creation unto Christ) more worthy of encouragement than praise, in that they attempted a thing above human

human capacity. Paræus was then among the latest writers, who took upon him to number the years, even to Christ's time, out of the holy scriptures; he, therefore, leaving the astronomical, betook himself to the politic time of the Hebrews, &c. In this business, Usher thought it an indifferent matter, what rule were applied to the measuring of time, so it were known, and terminated with a certain number of days. If any one could by some equal measure of years define the distance between the foundation of the world, and Christ's time; it were also most easy, without the help of astronomical tables, to set down how many equinoxes in number did happen, during that interval; and the noted revolution from one equinox to the same point again, what is it but a year, natural and truly astronomical? But, if any one well seen in the knowledge, not only of sacred and exotic history, but of astronomical calculation, and the old Hebrew calendar, shall apply himself to these studies, he judges it indeed difficult, but not impossible to attain, not only the number of years, but even of days, from the creation of the world*.

THESE expedients the very learned and judicious primate adopted, but, like Phaeton, without success:

In great attempts 'tis glorious e'en to fall.

To give a small epitome of the various opinions held by the best astronomers on this subject, Strauchius inserts

* * Usher's Preface to his Annals.

half

half a hundred. Of these a few are here selected, which fix the creation to a date later than the seventh century of the Julian Period.

	Yrs.	M		Yrs.	M.
Jacobus Capellus	708	3	Joannes Micro-		
John Wichman	709	3	elius -	766	10
Usher and Simpson	710	9	Matthæus Bero-		
Dion. Petavius	730	9	aldus -	786	9
Philip Melancton	750		Jewish vulgar date	953	9
Scaliger, Calvi-			David Gantz	954	2
fius, &c.	764	9	Jewish lesser Chro-		
Christianus Sco-			nicle -	1044	8
tanus -	765	9			

THE Jewish vulgar computation abridges the chronology of their own annals by about 250 years. This mistake arose not from any deliberate or malicious design to corrupt their records, as many of the Christian fathers, Whiston, and his followers, most uncharitably affirm; for to preserve their records entire and pure, they have, in all ages, exemplified a laudable zeal;—but from a fatal ignorance in chronology and history. Misunderstanding the true Mosaical computation, they refer the birth of Abraham to the 70th, and not the 130th, of Terah, its true date. Thus are 60 years retrenched from the age of the world. Again taking Longimanus, Mnemon, and Ochus, for one and the same Artaxerxes, Nothus and Codomannus for one and the same Darius, they reduce the duration of the Persian empire from 204 to 48 years. In other instances they betray equally

equally striking proofs of ignorance in their own chronology, and in the history of the Gentile monarchies. These specimens alone establish the imputation of inaccuracy, from ignorance, not design.

“As long as they [the Jews] continued in the east, they continued in the eastern usage of computation by the era of contracts, as they called that of the Seleucidæ; but when, about the year of our Lord 1040, they were driven out of the east, and forced to remain in these western parts, and here settled in Spain, France, England and Germany, they learned from some of the Christian chronologers of these countries to compute by the years from the creation. The first year of this era, according to their reckoning, falls in the year of the Julian Period 953, and takes its beginning from the autumnal equinox in that year. But the true year of the creation, according to Scaliger's computation, was 189 years, and according to others, 249 years higher up than where this era of the Jews placeth it *.”

THIS very judicious critic and historian remarks, “That the era from the creation is of very common use in chronology; but this on account of its uncertainty he has rejected, most chronologers following different opinions, some reckoning the time sooner, some later, and scarce any two agreeing in the same year †.”

* Prid. Connex. Part i. p. 426, fol.

† Prid. Pref. page vii.

OF the pagan writers some maintained the eternity of the world, others affirmed, that it had a beginning; but all of this class professed their ignorance of the time. “If,” says Censorinus, “the origin of the universe were known, I should thence begin to reckon. Whether time had a first source, or always did exist, the number of its years cannot be defined*.” Ptolemy the astronomer asserts, “That the epoch of time lies beyond the limits of human knowledge†:” and Jul. Firmicus Maternus censures the rashness of those who pretend certainty in a matter so impenetrably dark‡.

IT has been shewn, that the Jews had no skill to connect the genealogical numbers of Moses, on which the chronology of the first AGES is constructed, or to apply to their own history the reigns of the Persian monarchs:—that they erred from ignorance;—and ought to be acquitted from the calumny of wilfully corrupting their records. In like manner has it been evinced, that of all the Christian chronologers, few have ascertained, to the satisfaction of the public, the precise quantity of the interval from Adam to our era.

HERE was a subject worthy the decision of Sir Isaac Newton;—a subject of doubt and perplexity, to the elucidation of which his penetrating, extensive, and vigorous faculties, were much more than commensurate. He either adopted implicitly the erroneous scheme of

* De Die Nat. c. 20, 21.

† Gr. Syntaxis, lib. iii.

‡ Mathes, l. iii. c. 2.

Uther's Annals, or perceived the fallacy, and thought it obvious to all the world.

THAT very accurate calculator, the late Mr. James Ferguson, acknowledges, " That he had studied chronology but very little * : " and censures his antagonist, " for pretending to have found out in what year of the Jul. Period the world was created :—a thing, about which not only Moses and the prophets have been silent ; but even our Saviour and his apostles also :—and consequently a thing, which no man now can know, without an immediate revelation from Heaven, which we are not to expect †."

IN another part of his valuable works, Mr. Ferguson modestly remarks : " In fixing the year of the CREATION to the 706th year of the Jul. Period, which was the 4007th before that of Christ's birth, I have followed the Reverend Mr. Bedford, in his Scripture Chronology, printed A. D. 1730, and Mr. Kennedy, in a work of the same title, 1762. Mr. Bedford only takes it for granted, that the world was created about the time of the autumnal equinox ; but Mr. Kennedy affirms, that the said equinox was about the noon of the fourth day in the creation week, and that the moon was then 24 hours past her opposition to the sun.—If Moses had told us the same things, we should have had sufficient data for the era of the creation : but as he has been silent on these points, we must consider

* Letter ii. to Kennedy, page 9.

† Letter i. page 3.

the best accounts of chronologers as hypothetical and uncertain *."

HERE is a proper mixture of censure and caution ; and both, in some degree misapplied ; for,

1. MOSES has actually afforded sufficient data for the date of the creation. He has told us that with the time of the Exodus a change of stile, by which the seventh month from the creation became the first from the release. Bedford and Kennedy rightly dated the formation of the solar system from the autumnal equinox ; and it is well known, that the Passover, an annual solemnity in the Jewish church, and to this day observed, was ordained about the time of the opposite cardinal point. The conclusion is, that a definite number of full years, and six supernumerary months, had elapsed from the primeval week to the first Passover.

2. BOTH Bedford and Kennedy, with every criterion of truth, fix the primeval week in astronomical coincidence with the autumnal equinox, and the last week of October, A. P. J. 706.

3. THOSE learned men mistook the true year of the Exodus, the former, misled by Usher's combination of numbers, refers the time to the year of the Julian Period 3218 ; whence deduct 705, the antemundan years of that period, the remainder, 2513, denotes the year of the world, the same with that in the Annals, though erroneously put in coincidence by the Primate with A. P. J. 3223. The latter, Kennedy, antedates the

* Astronomy, 1770, octavo, p. 379.

egress by one year; and is so much the farther from chronological verity.

4. FROM the primeval week in the first of Adam's life, to the week of the Exodus, in the 80th of Moses; the intermediate space is precisely 2514 years six months; or 26 weeks to a day: $2515 + 705 = 3220$, the true number of the Jul. Period. Ferguson happily agrees with his two predecessors, as to that number of this period which characterises the primeval year; but all three, together with the Metropolitan, have miscalculated the year of the egress.

WITH great truth and justice does Ferguson censure the astronomical part of Kennedy's scheme; nor is his work more accurate in chronological arrangement. A train of scientific deceptions pervades the entire mass. Some few instances of reprehension seem to be overdone.

1. KENNEDY is blamed for affirming, that the time of the autumnal equinox was at the noon of the fourth day in the creation week, and that the moon was then 24 hours past her opposition to the sun. This calculation may be exceptionable. But the critic overstrains his antagonist's meaning, when he infers from his words, that the moon actually existed before the sun*. It implies no absurdity to suppose, that the two luminaries, in the moment of their creation, might have been in the position described by Kennedy, if so were the appointment of the Almighty Maker. Whether

* See Letter ii. to Kennedy.

the fact is capable of proof by the rules of calculation is a different matter. Ferguson's calculation may be more exact, though not absolutely certain.

THE result of his operation is, "that the true time of the autumnal equinox, for the longitude of Babylon, was October 23, at 19 hours, 22 minutes, 41 seconds, which in the common way of reckoning is October 24, at 22 minutes 41 seconds past seven in the morning." The author subjoins the following note: "The reason why this calculation makes the autumnal equinox, in the year of the Julian Period 706, to be two days sooner than the time of the same equinox mentioned in page 153, is, that in that page, the mean time only is taken into the account, as if there were no equation of the sun's motion."

"THE equation at the time of the equinox then, did not exceed an hour and a quarter, when reduced to time.—But in the year of Christ 1756, (which was 5763 years after), the equation at the autumnal equinox amounted to one day, 22 hours, 24 minutes; by which quantity the *true* time fell later than the *mean*. So that, if we consider the *true* time of this last mentioned equinox, only as mean time, the mean motion of the sun, carried thence back to the autumnal equinox, in the year of the Julian Period 706, will fix it to the 25th of October in that year."

HERE are two methods prescribed for ascertaining the time of the autumnal equinox, and fixing the sun's place to the sign Libra on the fourth day of the creation week. The former, by mean time, as more direct,

is preferable. The author refers to another calculation, (Example vi. p. 311), where it is shewn, that the true time of the full moon at Babylon was the 23d October, at 42 minutes 46 seconds past six in the morning. "This he (informs his readers) some suppose to have been the year of the creation; and the result is, that the autumnal equinox was on the next day after the day of the full moon. The Dom. Letter for that year was G, and consequently the 24th of October was on a Wednesday *."

LET the *true* time of the autumnal equinox, A. D. 1656, which the author considers only as *mean* time, be applied to the true time of the full moon on the day before the same equinox, in the number of the Julian Period 706; that full moon will fall within the limits of the same day with the primeval equinox. Scientific precision can, perhaps, bring the approximation of the planetary positions to no greater exactness, with respect to a radical point in computation. It is requisite to reserve for astronomy all the credit due to its decisions, as far as they afford light in disquisitions so intricate and complicated; proper regard being still had to physical probability, to the different terms whence the natural and the civil day may be, or has been, computed, and to the unequivocal notations of the sacred historian.

2. BE it remarked, that light was produced before the luminaries. As soon as the terraqueous mass had ac-

* Astron. p. 316, 8vo. 1770.

quired its globular form, and began to move round its axis, the CREATOR said, "LET LIGHT BE." The effect was a distinction of evening and morning, equivalent to night and day. When the evening and morning had measured the third day, that is, about six of the clock, on the evening of our Wednesday, *about* the time of the autumnal equinox, God created the two great luminaries, in a state of opposition, the sun in the lower hemisphere to dispense light by emanation, and the moon in the upper, to reflect it on the intermediate globe of earth; the air having previously been framed for its transmission. At six of the clock, on the morning of Thursday, the 25th of October, the sun first rose at Babylon, on the northern hemisphere, twelve hours after the time of the full moon.

3. ASTRONOMERS, for the greater ease and certainty of observation, count the 24 hours from noon to noon; we in Britain, from midnight to midnight; the ancient Babylonians and others began the reckoning from the rising sun; the Jews from sun-set. Moses seems to compute from six in the evening, the middle point between noon and midnight.

4. MR. Kennedy was certainly licentious in assuming arbitrary postulates, under the sanction of Mosaical principles, which led him into absurd conclusions; and these he imposed on the public belief, with no small share of dogmatical empiricism. His Censor, Mr. Ferguson, disgusted with his overbearing humour, and exasperated by personal reproaches, especially in calling

him, “ *an illiterate and incompetent judge,*” mixed an infusion of irritability with some of his strictures *.”

MR. Kennedy was justly reprehensible for many precarious conjectures, set forth, in plausible disguise, as infallible axioms in the Mosaical chronology, which are the wanton fictions of his own excursive fancy.

THAT the autumnal equinox fell in the middle of the primeval week, A. P. J. 706, is a fact asserted by

* One instance, which seems a deviation from Mr. Ferguson's usual composure of temper, is selected from his First Letter, p. 2. “ You may abuse me as much as you please; but however *illiterate* you take me to be, I believe I know the meaning of the few Hebrew words at the bottom of this page; which I need not explain to you, who are a good Hebrew scholar, and too well acquainted with your Bible to be at any loss where to find them. As many, who read this, may be quite ignorant of the Hebrew language, I shall neither give the English meaning of them, nor direct where to find them, because I would not willingly raise a laugh against you.” The Hebrew words are from Prov. xxvi. 4., and thus rendered in our public version: “ Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou be also like unto him.”

That he was *illiterate* is a common, but a false allegation. He had the benefit of a classical education in a nobleman's family, under the tuition of an able preceptor, and no mean proficient in mathematical learning, which studies Mr. Ferguson afterward prosecuted under the famous Maclaurin. In many branches of learning he made no small progress without the aid of a master; and if he did not rise to eminent skill in the more abstruse mysteries of mathematical science, he excelled in the faculty of inventing middle terms for conducting experiments, and deducing important conclusions.

Moses

Moses though not in direct terms, yet by induction. That the full moon happened precisely 24 hours before the sun entered Libra in the same week Moses does not affirm, either in explicit terms, or by implication. Ferguson assigns an earlier date by almost five hours for the true time of that equinox, and anticipates the full moon by 25 hours. Yet neither the one nor the other meant to assert the strange paradox, that the earth's one satellite shone forth, in direct opposition to the sun, before his existence. Neither did he incur acrimonious censure for affirming, that the fourth day of the original week was the sixteenth of the original month. It is well known, that the Jews regulated all their computations for festivals, &c. from the first day of the first month, after the visibility of the moon; and it would be a very preposterous arrangement, to reckon the beginning of a month and year from a full moon. "From the moon is the sign of feasts, a light that declineth in her perfection. The month is called after her name *." The sacred year at the egress was counted from the day of the moon's visibility after the conjunction, and not from the next full moon, coincident with the 14th of the first month. An opposition of the two great luminaries implies a prior conjunction, whether within, or beyond the limits of antemundan duration.

MR. Ferguson allows Mr. Kennedy the merit of confirming what others had suggested;—the coincidence of the first day in the Jewish and Christian week with

* Ecclus. xliii. 7.

the seventh of the patriarchal;—and the time of the crucifixion with the number of the Jul. Period 4746. This concession authenticates the date assumed for the creation, A. P. J. 706. For if either event be referred to any other year, the harmonious evidence arising from astronomy, chronology, history, and prophecy, like the confusion of tongues at Babel, becomes discordant *.

* Those superficial readers, whose minds have derived a tincture of scepticism from the romantic pretensions of the ancient and modern Orientals to a very remote origin, it may be difficult to persuade, that the solar system has not existed more than 58 centuries. But the objection is impertinent and absurd. For since it is impossible, that the world should be eternal, it *must* have had a beginning, and the time was, when it could not be older than it is now. If, therefore, it had existed earlier by millions of years, it might still, with equal reason, be asked, Why was not the universe created 10 times as many millions sooner? See this argument properly stated, in Dr. R. Jenkin's *Reasonableness and Certainty of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION*, vol. ii. p. 204. Lond. 1721.

C H A P. II.

DEVIATIONS *from* HISTORICAL ORDER.1. *Accession of SAUL and Heroism of JONATHAN.*

“ **I**N the year before the Christian era 1069, Saul is made king of Israel, and, by the hand of Jonathan, gets a great victory over the Philistines *.”

HERE is a portentous confusion of incidents and dates. Usher connects the inauguration of the father with the year before Christ 1095, which antedates the true term by two years; and Sir Isaac brings it into coincidence with the son's memorable victory over the Philistine armies. It has been shown, that Saul, when privately anointed, was 31 years old, and that the Metropolitan despoils him of the sovereignty, after a short reign of two years. According to him the war, in which Jonathan gathered so many laurels, began in the third of Saul's reign, and 34th of his life, when a choice young man, and a goodly. In the very commencement of hostilities Jonathan's feats in generalship exceeded his years and experience. So incredible are

* Short Chronicle, page 11.

the achievements ascribed to his valour, while a stripling, that every probable reason induces the necessity of referring the date of that war to a more protracted period of his life, and of his father's reign.

THIS expedient is necessary to prevent the discord of history with the course of nature. For, if Saul were made king of Israel, according to the doctrine of the Annals, in the year before Christ 1095, and this war with the Philistines brake out 1093, (the 33d of his age),—if likewise Jonathan smote a garrison of the Philistines in Geba *, his age could not exceed 14 years :—the natural inference is, that the date of the war must be deferred to a more advanced stage of the son's life.

AGAIN, if this war began eight years before the birth of David, and lasted to the 20th of his age, when Samuel denounced the removal of the kingdom from Saul's family, that long season of oppression and servitude was coincident with all the other wars in that reign :—the war with Moab, Ammon, Edom, Zobah †. The recovery of the kingdom is a pure fiction of the Annalist. For the sacred historian dates Saul's reign from the time he was privately anointed at Rama, and mentions this war with the Philistines as subsequent to those already specified, but prior to that with Amalek. By every criterion of time it was a war of one single campaign, begun and ended in the year before the vulgar Christian era 1069, or A. M. 2939, when Jonathan's age might be 30, as in the 63d page of this ANALYSIS,

* 1 Sam. xiii. 3.

† 1 Sam. xiv. 47.

THE illustrious Author of the *Short Chronicle*, finding the Primate's *Arrangements*, for this Period, involved in artificial perplexity, had recourse to a bold, but inadequate conjecture, which brings into coincidence the accession of the father, and the military achievements of the son.

It is *inadequate*; because Saul was invested with royalty in the 31st of his age. It has above been shewn that Jonathan is always put first in the register of his brothers, a not unlikely token of primogeniture;—that Ishbosheth, or Eshbaal*, the youngest of four, succeeded his father on the throne of the ten tribes, at the age of 40†; and was consequently born in the first of that reign. Besides Ahinoam, Saul is said to have had no other wife or concubine. She, therefore, was most probably the mother of his four sons. Suppose them born, each after an interval of 18 months, Jonathan was but six years old at the time of his father's accession; and no more than 15, if born in the 16th of his father's life; the earliest age of procreation recorded in the Bible. But the age even of 15, though it were certain that he was so old in the first of that reign, is inadequate to his military skill, experience, courage, and success, exemplified in the sacred history.

ON the whole, Sir Isaac Newton's *Scheme* is encumbered with all the difficulties which perplex the computation in the *Annals*. But, if this Philistine war be brought 28 years lower than the date assigned by

* 3 Sam. ii. 8. and 1 Chron. viii. 33.

† 2 Sam. ii. 10.

Usher;

Usher; and the accession of Saul carried 28 years higher than in the *Short Chronicle*; the sacred history is consistent with itself, with the verity of computation, and with the course of NATURE.

2. *Coexistence of SHISHAC and SESOSTRIS with REHOBOAM.*

“IN the year before Christ 974, Sefac spoils the Temple, and invades Syria and Persia, setting up pillars in many places *.” “Sesostris in the 5th year of Rehoboam, came out of Egypt with a great army, spoiled the Temple, reduced Judea into servitude, and went on conquering, first eastward toward India, which he invaded, and then westward as far as Thrace †.”

HERE again is a train of controvertible postulates. From the testimony of the sacred writers, in two texts ‡, the Greek interpreters call Shishac, *Sousakim*; and of Josephus §, who gives the name *Sousacos*; certain it is, that he was contemporary with Rehoboam. The dynasties, as constructed by Eusebius and Syncellus, characterize *Souffakeim* as the son of Smendes, or Vennephes, the 66th king numbered by Syncellus; whereas Sethos, Sethosis, Sesostris, or Sefac, is the 55th of Manetho. These notations are at variance with identity.

SIR I. Newton argues, “That Sefac and Sesostris were kings of ALL Egypt, at one and the same time; and that they agree not only in the time, but in their actions and conquests. Where Herodotus describes the expe-

* Short Chronicle, p. 20.

† Chronol. ch. ii. p. 216.

‡ 1 Kings, xiv. 25. and 2 Chron. xii. 9.

§ Ant. viii. 10. 3.

dition of Sesostris, Josephus tells us, that he described the expedition of Sefac, and attributed his actions to Sesostris, erring only in the name of the king. Corruptions of names are frequent in history : Sesostris was otherwise called Sefochris, Sefoofis, Sethosis, Sefonchis *". " Egypt was at first divided into many smaller kingdoms, like other nations, and grew into one monarchy by degrees."

ALL great empires were composed of petty principalities, accumulated by successive conquests ; and, if Egypt were at first under the government of several independent chieftains, with local jurisdiction, it was consolidated into one monarchy long before the days of Rehoboam. In the time of Abraham and Jacob, it was under one sovereign. " When Joseph was set over ALL the land of Egypt, Pharaoh only in THE THRONE was greater than he ; and, when the seven years of dearth began to come, and the dearth was in ALL lands ; in ALL the land of Egypt was bread : and when ALL the land of Egypt was famished, the people cried to Pharaoh for bread †." Every circumstance indicates one supreme monarch, and one prime minister, over the WHOLE land. About the time of Moses' birth " arose A NEW KING, who knew not Joseph." His name too was Pharaoh. At the egress, the Pharaoh of those days, with all his host, perished in the Red Sea ‡.

HERODOTUS

* Chronol. ch. i. p. 68.

† Gen. xli. 40—57.

‡ Herodotus makes Pheron the son and successor of Sesostris. Sir I. Newton affirms, that he was the first of the Pharaohs ;

HERODOTUS and D. Siculus, do not mention the father or predecessor of Sesostris. But Josephus, quoting from Manetho, records, that Amenôphis was the father of Sethôsis. Africanus and Eusebius place Amenophis last in the 18th dynasty, and Sethos first in the 19th; Africanus, in his 12th dynasty, inserts Sesostris as the successor of Ammenemis.

SIR J. Marsham, and Sir I. Newton take for granted, that Amenophis, Ammemenes, Ammon, and Memnon, were one and the same person, otherwise called Jupiter; and that Bacchus, Osiris, Sethos, Sethosis, Sesonchosis, Sefac, were but different names for Sesostris. If this be a discovery, it is a fabric built on conjecture, and the conclusion, weak, as the hypothesis is ambiguous.

SESOSTRIS and Sefac, it is said, reigned at the same time over all Egypt. But other chronologers, on grounds equally probable, refer the former to the times of the patriarch Jacob; and a third class represent him to be the Pharaoh who was drowned in the Red Sea. These surmises are, perhaps, all alike uncertain. Of Sesostris nothing occurs, but in poetical traditions, or legendary catalogues of kings, without chronological notations. The time of Sefac's existence is determined by infallible authority.

BUT farther; to neither the one nor the other, or to any one Egyptian monarch, so early as the days of Rehoboam, can the achievements, long voyages, and

Pharaohs; that in the reign of Afa he was drowned in the Nile; and that he was afterward deified under the name of Orus.

extensive

extensive conquests, enumerated by Sir Isaac Newton, be ascribed. This great author postulates, "That Amon, the father of Sesostris, having, by the assistance of the Edomites, built a fleet on the Red Sea, the son coasted Arabia Felix, sailed beyond the Persian Gulf, and in those countries set up columns, with inscriptions, denoting his conquests. After these things, he invaded and conquered Libya, prepared a fleet on the Mediterranean, penetrated as far as the Ocean, and at the mouth of the Straits set up the famous pillars. At length he came out of Egypt and spoiled the Temple *. The assistance of the Edomites is the baseless fabric of a vision. That people first acquired reputation as navigators in the *Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended*.

THE Egyptians at the time specified, and many ages after, had no skill in maritime affairs. In the infancy of arts, expeditions over a wide trackless sea, for traffic or conquest, were impracticable. "That of Sesostris has been considered as the most favourable era in the history of Egypt, for sending a colony into China. But, when examined with the greatest attention, it is nothing more than a sacerdotal fiction, without the smallest particle of reality. Megasthenes, cited by Strabo, was perfectly right in maintaining, that Sesostris had never set foot in India. What must be considered still more extravagant, is the opinion that he constructed a fleet of 600 long vessels, on the Red

* Chron. xi. 214.

Sea. This prodigy is placed at a period, when the ignorance of the Egyptians in navigation was extreme, because their aversion to the sea was invincible. Ship timber besides was so very scarce in Egypt, that a sufficient quantity could with difficulty be found for completing the vessels employed on the Nile, and the different canals. It was, surely, after many unsuccessful attempts, that boats were constructed of baked earth, an invention hitherto never imitated by any nation. The method of burning these vessels, of giving them a certain degree of strength by exactness of proportions, of varnishing and covering them with rushes, is now unknown. When the Ptolomeys endeavoured to establish a trade with India by the Red Sea, the want of wood forced them to use wretched barks, stitched with reeds and papyrus. It appears likewise, that they were always conducted by Greek pilots; for the Egyptians understood nothing of working them *.

ISAIAH, who prophesied two full centuries after Rehoboam, thus describes the state of navigation in Egypt, while he denounces execrations on the Æthiopians; “Wo to the land, shadowing with wings, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, that sendeth embassadors by the sea, even in *vessels* of bulrushes upon the waters †.” Too bold, in a serious history of arts and wars, is the paradox of powerful fleets, conveyed from the Nile to the Eastern Ocean, in vessels of earth, burnt like

* Paw's *Dissertations on the Egyptians and Chinese*, vol. i. p. 28.

† Isa. xviii. 1.

bricks in a kiln, and covered with bulrushes for wings or sails. Now if the Egyptians in Rehoboam's time were so very inexperienced in naval architecture and the art of steering, much less will it appear credible that Sesostris constructed a fleet of 600 long vessels in an age so remote, as the Exodus.

It remains to be noted, that the authority of Herodotus and Josephus, alleged by Sir I. Newton for the identity of Sesostris and Shishac, is, as deficient and foreign to the purpose, inconclusive. Josephus relates almost in the words of the sacred records the transactions ascribed to Shishac *; without the least mention of Sesostris; and adds, "That Herodotus of Halicarnassus describes the same expedition, with the sole mistake of that king's name, who, without a battle, reduced Syria of Palestine, and made the men prisoners of war." The only passage in Herodotus, to which Josephus could possibly refer, seems to be Book II, or Euterpe, Chap. CI—CX. where the story of Sesostris is related; but the name of Shishac, or Sefac, does not once occur. Neither is it there affirmed that Sesostris reduced Syria of Palestine. The author indeed acknowledges that he had seen some monuments of conquests, gained by Sesostris, in that country. But this intelligence seems to merit no more credit than what is in the same passage asserted, that the Phenicians and Syrians of Palestine borrowed the custom of circumcision from Egypt.

* See Jos. Ant. viii. 10. 3. and 1 Kings, xiv. 25. 2 Chron. xii. 19.

3. *Co-existence of Sesostris and Danaus.*

BEFORE Christ 964 Danaus, with his daughters, fleeing from his brother Egyptus, i. e. from Sefac, comes into Greece *. The return of the one brother is assigned as the reason of the other's flight. "On the return of Sesostris into Egypt, his brother Danaus not only attempted his life, but also commanded his daughters, who were 50 in number, and had married the sons of Sesostris, to slay their husbands; and then fled with his daughters from Egypt, in a long ship of 50 oars. This flight was in the 14th year of Rehoboam. Danaus came first to Lindus in Rhodes, and there built a temple, and erected a statue to Minerva. Thence he sailed to Argos, where he arrived in the 15th or 16th of Rehoboam †." Here the postulate is assumed — that Sesostris was the brother of Danaus. Manetho, and he alone ‡, affirms, that Danaus and Egyptus were brothers. Perizonius assigns a very satisfactory reason for the improbability of this notion, as incompatible with genealogy, chronology, and history §. But were this hypothesis admitted, the identity of Sesostris, Egyptus, and Sefac, is still doubtful. Except Sir J. Marsham, and Sir I. Newton, none of all the chronologers brings

* Short Chron. p. 22.

† Chron. c. xi. 136.

‡ Others, besides Manetho, report the same thing; but on his sole authority has the co-existence of these persons, with the relation of brotherhood, obtained credit. If the fact were either uncertain or false, the frequent repetition of it by subsequent writers, could not give it confirmation.

§ Egypt. Orig. c. xvi. p. 334.

any of the three into co-existence with Solomon and Rehoboam. Josephus testifies, that the Israelites left Egypt 393 years before the arrival of Danaus at Argos *. This date may be inaccurate. But it is much less exceptionable than Sir I. Newton's hypothesis. Danaus had 50 daughters, all married before his flight from Egypt, 136 years prior to the 15th of Rehoboam. He could not therefore be the brother of Sefac in the Sacred History and Josephus, or of Sesostris in Herodotus.

WHETHER the dynasties be reckoned co-existent or successive, whether computation proceed in the retrograde or progressive series, by lunar, solar, or federal years, certainty is unattainable from the want of fixed periods, and regulating measures, applicable to collateral history, in the ages prior to Rehoboam and Shishac. Of many kings the names, with the length of their reigns, are unknown; and wide is the difference of opinions, in what order the links of the chain ought to be disposed. In short, to adjust history, by such registers, is a task scarcely more practicable than the decyphering of the hieroglyphics:

Who strives to fix them, by some certain rule,
May, by right rule and reason, play the fool. HOR.

3. *Co-existence of Zerubabel and Jeshua, with Ezra and Nehemiah.*

“THE history of the Jews set down in the Books of EZRA and NEHEMIAH, having suffered by time, wants

* Apion, i. 16.

some illustration. I shall therefore, state their history under Zerubabel, in the reigns of Cyrus, Cambyfes, and Darius Hyftafpis.”

“ IT is contained partly in the first three chapters of the Book of Ezra, and the first five verses of the fourth :—and partly in the Book of NEHEMIAH, from the 5th verse of the viith chapter, to the 9th verse of the xiith : for Nehemiah copied all this out of the Chronicles of the Jews, written before his days ; as may appear by reading the place, and considering that the Priests and Levites, who sealed the covenant, on the 24th of the viith month, Neh. x. were the very same with those who returned from the captivity, in the first year of Cyrus, Neh. xii. ; and that all those who returned did seal it. This will be perceived by comparifon of the names,” &c. *

IT is admitted, that the contents of Ezra's Book, from the beginning of the 1st to the end of the vith chapter relate wholly to the History of the Jews, under Zerubabel, in the reigns of Cyrus, Cambyfes, and Darius Hyftafpis : a few notations only excepted, which Sir Isaac refers, with exquisite discrimination, to subsequent reigns †.

* Chron. ch. vi. p. 358.

† For instance, the Ahasuerus, ch. iv. 6. was no other than Xerxes, the son and fucceffor of Dar. Hyftafpis ; and the Artaxerxes mentioned ch. iv. 7. 11. 23. and ch. vi. 14. was no other than Artaxerxes Longimanus, the son and fucceffor of the same Xerxes ; whose names are inferted in the history by anticipation.

BUT it must not be dissembled, that the transactions recorded between verse 5th, Neh. viith, and verse 9th, ch. xiith of the same Book, are all subsequent to the reigns of Cyrus, Cambyfes, and Darius Hyftaspis. With all proper deference to the memory, and literary merit, of Sir I. Newton, be it affirmed, that, except two genealogical registers, professedly inserted as originals, or rather as actual extracts, no one incident, in the Book of Nehemiah, is prior in date to the 20th of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Nehemiah copied nothing from the Jewish Chronicles, written before his time, besides the two family registers, framed in the first of Cyrus, and again produced as vouchers in the 21st of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the son of Xerxes.

IN the remainder of the sixth chapter, which treats of the Persian Empire, this great man confounds, in promiscuous disorder, the transactions in the reigns of Xerxes, and of Artaxerxes Longimanus, with those of their three predecessors, Cyrus, Cambyfes, and Dar. Hyftaspis *.

THESE transactions, disposed in parallel columns, according to their several dates, will be sufficient to evince, that the persons who sealed the Covenant, Neh. xii. were quite different from those, who returned in the first of Cyrus.

ZERUBABEL and Jeshua	NEHEMIAH	came to
came to Jerusalem in the	Jerusalem in the	20th of
1st of Cyrus, A. M. 3473.	Art. Long.	A. M. 3564.

* See p. 359—361.

In the 7th month of that year, the altar built, the feast of tabernacles kept, materials and artificers provided for the second Temple.

IN the second of Cyrus the Temple founded: the work obstructed during that and the subsequent reign; finished in the 6th, and dedicated in the 7th, Dar. Hyft. A. M. 3494*.

THE building of the city opposed in the 1st of Xerxes A. M. 3584†. Prohibited by a decree of Art. Long. A. M. 3545‡: that decree reversed by the commission granted to Ezra, in 3551§. Ezra makes an end of dissolving irregular marriages 3552||.

THE history continued in the Book of Esther, to the 13th of Art. Long. 3557.

In the 21st of Art. on the 6th month, the wall finished; and in the 7th m. the Law read, the feast of tabernacles kept, with great solemnity: on the 24th a Fast; a covenant of reformation ratified; Neh. x. throughout, A. M. 3565.

THENCEFORWARD the rulers dwell at Jerusalem, the people cast lots to dwell, one in ten, in the holy city, and nine parts to dwell in the other cities of Judah, Neh. xi. 1, 2. Then follow the names of those who came from Babylon with Nehemiah in the 20th of Artaxerxes, which are quite different from those who accompanied Ezra, in the 7th of the same reign; as also from the retinue of Zerubabel in the first of Cyrus.

* Ezr. ch. i. to vi. 22.

† Ezr. iv. 7.

§ Ezr. vii. 9.

‡ Ezr. iv. 6.

|| Ezr. x. 17.

PRIDEAUX fully observes, that the Nehemiah and Mordecai, in Ezra, ii. 2. were not the Nehemiah and Mordecai of whom so much is said in the Books of NEHEMIAH and ESTHER, but quite different persons of the same name *. Sir I. Newton, unhappily receding from that cautious and amiable diffidence, which, in ambiguous cases, distinguished him from the petulance of dogmatists, affirms in terms by far too peremptory, “ Yea Nehemiah, the same Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, who was the Tirshatha, subscribed the covenant in the reign of Cyrus †.” It is carefully to be noted ;—that the Nehemiah, who accompanied Zerubabel, is not distinguished, in the Book of Ezra, by his family or office ; for the Tirshatha, in ch. ii. 63, could be no other than Zerubabel himself ; and the Tirshatha, Neh. viii. 9. mentioned together with Ezra, the Priest and Scribe, could be no other than that Nehemiah who came from Shushan to Jerusalem in the 20th of Artaxerxes I. The Law was not read, no occasional Fast was kept, no covenant of reformation was subscribed in the first of Cyrus. The interval hence to the 20th of Artaxerxes is 91 years ; a circumstance extremely unfavourable to the supposition of one and the same Nehemiah.

OUR illustrious author seems to have been misled by a variation in orthography or dialect, when he supposed, that Ezra the Priest and Scribe, who read the law, Neh. viii. accompanied Zerubabel and Jeshua

* Connex. P. i, p. 106. † Chron. vi. 368.

from Babylon, in the first of Cyrus. Of an Ezra, invested with the designations of Priest and Scribe, no mention occurs in the Book, inscribed with that name, before ch. vii. 1. where he is characterized as a son of Seraiah, the 14th in descent from Aaron. He certainly was the predecessor and colleague of Nehemiah, in Judea, during the reign of the first Artaxerxes. But whence did Sir I. Newton surmise, that this Ezra returned in the first of Cyrus, contrary to his own testimony ; which fixes his removal from Babylon to the first day of the first month, in the 7th year of Artaxerxes, and his arrival at Jerusalem, in the 5th month of the same year * ? His sole authority seems to be Neh. xii. 1. where we read, "Now these are the priests and levites who went up with Zerubabel and Jeshua, Seraiah, Jeremiah, Ezra." But in the original register, Ezra, ii. 1. &c. Ezra is not expressed in any of the classes. In Neh. x. 2. Seraiah, Azariah, (probably Ezra, the priest and scribe), with Jeremiah, are said to have sealed the covenant, as priests ; but it is not affirmed, that they returned in the first of Cyrus. The Ezra, Neh. xii. 1. 13. might have arrived with Jeshua, the chief of the sacerdotal order ; but it does not appear that these were the very same persons who ratified the covenant in the 21st of Artaxerxes. If Ezra were an officiating priest at the end of the captivity, his age *then* was at least 31, full 92 years before he read the law eight days in continuous

* Ezr. vii. 8, 9.

order from morning to mid-day, in the ears of ALL the PEOPLE. Such exertion was scarcely credible at the age of 123.

As distinct persons, so different dates, are taken for the same ;—the 7th month in the pontificate of Joia-kim, A. M. 3565, being confounded with the 7th month in the pontificate of his father Jeshua, 3473 ;—the feast of tabernacles in the first of Cyrus, with the same festival, kept with more solemnity in the 21st of Artaxerxes. These are but a specimen.

It cannot be admitted, that Nehemiah copied from Jewish Chronicles, written before his time, the things related in his Book from the 5th verse of the viith chapter, to the 9th of the xiith : much less, that the same things were all of a date prior to the reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes Longimanus, as is affirmed*.

THE Historian acknowledges the authority of no record written before the time of Artaxerxes, except a genealogical register of them who had come up at the first. This register he found either among the deeds preserved in the collection of national archives, since the days of Jeshua, or its extract in the second chapter of Ezra's History, if then published. Its title is, "Now these are the children of the province, who went up out of the captivity, whom Nebuchadnezzar carried away unto Babylon, and came again unto Jerusalem and Judah, every man unto his city, with Zerubabel." In both its copies † the general

* Chron. ch. vi. p. 363.

† Ezra, ii. and Neh. vii.

number is, 42,360, but the partial sums, as reckoned up by their families in Ezra, amount only to 29,818; and in Nehemiah, to 31,031. The meaning of which is, as Dr. Prideaux observes, they are only the tribes of Judah Benjamin, and Levi, who are reckoned by their families, in both these places, the rest, being of the other tribes of Israel, are numbered only in the gross sum, and this in both computations makes the gross sum so much exceed the partial sums*.

It must be allowed that the numbers and names of those priests and levites, Nehemiah, xii. 1—9. who went with Zerubabel, agree nearly with the princes, priests, and levites, chapter x. 1—13. who sealed the covenant. But this general agreement does not evince an identity of the persons. Dr. Wall properly considers the names in the last mentioned catalogue as the families, or descendants, of those who accompanied Zerubabel and Jeshua, almost a century before. To explode the incoherent hypothesis of Sir I. Newton, sufficient it is to recollect that Ezra first arrived at Jerusalem in the 7th of Artaxerxes, with about 1500 attendants, distinct and separate from the colony in the first of Cyrus;—and that Nehemiah set about the reparation of the city-wall, in the pontificate of Eliashib, the grandson of Jeshua, no less than 110 years from the foundation of the second temple.

FOR the imperfections found in the chronology of the Persian Empire the Editor offers the following

* See Prid. Connex. Part i. p. 107.

apology. “ The sixth chapter was not copied out with the other five, which makes it doubtful, whether the author intended to print it. But being found among his papers, and evidently appearing to be a continuation of the same work, and, (as such abridged in the Short Chronicle), it was thought proper to be added. Had the great author himself lived to publish this work, there would have been no occasion for this advertisement. But, as it is, the reader is desired to allow for such imperfections, as are inseparable from posthumous pieces.” This chapter, with all its deficiencies and mistakes, exhibits striking signatures of judicious discrimination. The author’s oversights were those of a masterly genius. Even this least elaborate section of the Ancient Chronology is, in several respects, a valuable acquisition ; especially, as it shews the fallacy of confounding Cambyfes and Smerdis with Ahafuerus and Artaxerxes, in Ezra, iv. 6, 7 ; for thus are rectified the preposterous and fanciful arrangements of Usher, Prideaux, Bedford, &c. This equitable concession, however, does not vindicate conclusions, incompatible with chronology, history, and the circumscribed period of natural life.

4. *The dates assigned for several arts and usages, coeval with social life, are improbable :* for instance,

Agriculture. “ Ceres, a woman of Sicily, comes into Attica, and teaches the Greeks to sow corn ; for which benefaction she was deified. She first taught the art to Triptolemus, the young son of Celeus, king of Eleusis :

Eleufis : before Chrift 1030. Arcas, the fon of Callisto, and grandson of Lycaon, and Eumelus the firft king of Achaia, receive bread-corn from Triptolemus : B. C. 1020 *.”

THE cultivation of the ground was introduced in the firft age, transmitted to the laft generation of the old world, and revived by Noah, after the Flood †. An art fo indifpenfably neceffary to the comfortable fubfiftence of the human kind, in the progreflive ftages of population, could in no fubfequent period be loft. Much more probable is the pofition, that its advances to perfection kept pace with the continual improvements in all the fubfidiary arts. At the time of the difperfon, the feveral colonies carried to their new fettlements all the fkill and experience of paft ages, and, among the reft of the ufeul arts, AGRICULTURE.

To the fons of Japhet immediately after the feparation from Babel, were the ifles of the Gentiles, comprehending Greece, affigned. Extremely abfurd is the notion, that they could increafe and multiply, and replenish the earth, without fubduing the foil, by the various arts of making it fruitful. The old fabulous chronology brings the different migrations from Egypt into Greece many ages lower than the days of Japhet. Sir John Marfham connects the arrival of Ceres in Greece with the time of Joshua's death, 13 generations after the difperfon in the days of Peleg. It is not

* Short Chronicle, p. 15.

† Gen. iv. 1. and ch. ix. 20.

credible that the use of corn was unknown in Greece, from its first plantation, by the sons of Japhet, to the days of Joshua ; much less, that agriculture, one of the primeval arts, was first introduced into that country, in the reign of David.

Early use of animal food in Egypt.

“ THE Egyptians lived only on the fruits of the earth and abominated flesh eaters*. They originally fared hardly and abstained from animals. Menes taught them to adorn their beds and tables with rich furniture, and brought in among them a sumptuous, delicious, and voluptuous way of life†.” This Menes is, by a fatality of computation, put the third in succession after the supposed Sefac or Sesostris of Sir I. Newton ; and, in connexion with so very recent a criterion of time, the term *originally* is most unhappily combined. Abstinence from animal food was the natural consequence of brute worship. Every circumstance recorded of the Egyptians, in the days of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph, induces the full conviction, that Monotheism, the religion of the Hebrew Patriarchs, was likewise the national religion of that country. Till divine honours were paid to certain species of animals, their flesh was no less commonly used for food than the fruits of the earth : and that such honours were not paid to them in the life-time of Joseph may fairly be presumed from the history of that time. The chief baker’s dream

* Short Chron. p. 9.

† Chron. p. 241.

of white baskets, containing all manner of baked meats for Pharaoh, implies the use of animal food. Joseph ordered the chief ruler of his house to SLAY and make ready, for the entertainment of his brethren, who were to dine with him at noon. This sort of idolatry and abstinence was the invention of a subsequent age. For the Israelites in the wilderness recollected with discontent and impatience the time when they sat by the flesh pots of Egypt, and did eat bread to the full. They remembered too the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic: Hence it is evident, that the pot-herbs of Egypt were not then consecrated. Corruptions of this kind were most probably introduced, first of all, in the space between the death of Joseph and the egress *.

“ THE lower part of Egypt being yearly overflowed by the Nile, was scarce inhabited before the invention of corn, which made it useful: and the king, who by this invention, first peopled it, and reigned over it, perhaps the king of the city Mefir, where Memphis was afterward built, seems to have been worshipped by his subjects, after death, in the ox or calf, for this benefaction †.” It has been shewn, that the deification and consequent worship of animals can be traced no farther back than to the short interval from Joseph to the Exodus. At this latter term, and no sooner, Pharaoh permitted the Israelites to perform sacrifices

* For the origin of Brute and Image Worship, See Winder's History of Knowl. vol. i. ch. xiv.

† Chron. p. 197.

in his land ; but Moses remonstrated, that the slaughter of the sacred animals, in his dominions, would exasperate the inhabitants. Here is direct evidence for the existence of brute worship, and consequently of abstinence from animal food, in the time of that very generation, which recollected the flesh pots of Egypt. From the Exodus to the reign of Menes, who it is said succeeded Orus, the son of Sesostris, in the 16th of Asa, king of Judah, and first introduced into Egypt the sumptuous mode of living on animal food, the interval is 542 years. Sir Isaac Newton conjectures, that animal food was first permitted in Egypt, more than five centuries after it had been prohibited, as a sacrilegious profanation. That the lower part of that country, enriched by the yearly overflow of the Nile, was fully inhabited, long before it was conquered, by the Phenician shepherds, who fled from Joshua, is evident from this circumstance, that so early as the days of Joseph, the land of Egypt had become the granary of the world, and supplied all the contiguous nations with bread, during a grievous famine of seven years. In the passage, above quoted, this very eminent writer discovers a commendable degree of caution, in leaving undetermined the time and name of the king, who invented the art of raising corn, and fertilised the soil by means of the Nile. But if a date, posterior to the Exodus, be assigned for these improvements, it will be difficult to account for the power of the Egyptian empire, and the no less sudden than prodigious multiplication of the Israelites, at a period when, it is affirmed, that the
country

country was scarce inhabited. The Aborigines, doubtless, brought into their new settlement all the arts of the old, and of the restored world. Absurd is the supposition, that tillage once introduced could anywhere fall into disuse.

The rise of arts, and the foundation of cities in Asia Minor, Crete, Greece, and Libya, SIR I. NEWTON refers to the age of Cadmus, in the reign of David, an era too recent for credibility.

IN our language, as in every other, the sense of no word is, perhaps, more equivocal than CITY. Its most general meaning implies an assemblage of buildings occupied by a community of inhabitants. "Rome, properly speaking, was at first but a sorry village, whereof even the principal inhabitants followed their own ploughs *." Presumable it is, that many of the most ancient cities, did, in the structure, size, and number, of buildings, resemble some of our British hamlets. As the inhabitants multiplied they were enlarged. As the seats of empire, arts, or commerce, they rose gradually in importance.

"CAIN, who built the first city, called it after the name of his son, Enoch. The beginning of Nimrod's kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calnoh, now Bagdat, in the land of Shinar. Out of that land went forth Ashur the son of Shem, and built Nineveh, the CITY of Rehoboth, and Calah." The

* Hooke's Rom. Hist. vol. i. ch. 1.

first and last are called GREAT cities. Sidon, Gerar, Gaza, Sodom, and four other cities in Palestine, if not likewise Jerusalem, the metropolis of the ancient Jebusites, had become, some of them at least, very populous, not to speak of less honourable distinctions, prior to the arrival of Abram *. According to that one true hypothesis, which rests on the firm basis of historical evidence, Abram was certainly born in the 130th, not the 70th of his father's life. Hence Sir W. Raleigh deduces a very reasonable inference :
“ In this patriarch's time, all the then parts of the world were peopled ; all regions and countries had their kings. Egypt had many magnificent cities, and so had Palestine, and all the bordering countries ; yea, all that part of the world besides, as far as India : and those not built with sticks but of hewn stones and ramparts ; which magnificence needed a parent of more antiquity than those other men have supposed. Therefore, where the scriptures are plainest, and agree best with reason and nature, to what end should we labour to beget doubts and scruples, or draw all things into wonders and marvels ? giving also strength to common cavillers, and to those men's apish brains, who only bend their wits to find impossibilities and monsters in the story of the world and of mankind †.”

It cannot be denied, that some of Sir I. Newton's arrangements incur this censure. For instance—“ In

* See Gen. iv. 17. and ch. x. 10—19.

† History, p. 228.

the year before Christ 1080, Lycaon the son of Pelasgus builds Lycosura; Phoroneus the son of Inachus, Phoronium, afterwards called Argus; Ægialeus the brother of Phoroneus and son of Inachus, Ægialeum, afterwards called Sicyon: and these were the oldest towns in Peloponnesus. Till then they built only single houses, scattered up and down in the fields. About the same time Cecrops built Cecropia in Attica, afterwards called Athens; and Eleusine, the son of Ogyges, built Eleusis. These towns gave a beginning to the kingdoms of the Arcadians, Argives, Sicyons, Athenians, Eleusinians, &c. *"

THOSE who give credit to the fabulous antiquities of Egypt, mention three colonies, thence transplanted into Greece. Sir J. Marsham connects the first expedition under Phoroneus with the birth of Isaac; the next under Cecrops with that of Aaron; and the third under Danaus with the time of the Exodus. The intermediate space is four centuries. On Sir I. Newton's computation it is remarked, 1. That the foundation of those cities, and the rise of these kingdoms, are mentioned as events of the same date, i. e. "*much about the same time.*" 2. That the time assigned for such buildings is prior to the introduction of the arts, letters, music, metals, and their fabrication, from Phenicia under Cadmus. Perfection in architecture is not conceivable without the previous skill of separating metals from their dross, and of shaping them into various uten-

* Chron. p. 10.

file by the mould or the hammer. These arts were certainly much more ancient in the Lesser Asia, than the reign of David *. 3. Sir Isaac Newton seems to assume the postulate, that the Egyptians, who conducted successive colonies into Asia the Less, Crete, Greece, and Libya, found these countries either desolate, or in a state of barbarism. But it has been shewn, that the sons of Japhet were the first planters in a much more remote age. 4. Cadmus, it is affirmed, brought Letters, with other arts, sciences, and customs, of the Phenecians, into Bœotia, about 35 years after Lycaon built Lycosura †; that is, about the 12th year of David's reign. The date of this useful improvement is not now the subject of disquisition; for whether it be placed higher or lower, certain it is, that alphabetical composition was not applied to the history of the Greck colonies before the order, dates, and all the circumstances of the several migrations from other countries had entirely

* Cain the eldest son of Adam built a city, and Tubal Cain, one of his descendants, was an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron. This implies that the fabrication of metals was previously known. So large a vessel as the ark could not be constructed, without nails, bars, and plates, and so huge a pile, as the tower of Babel, required no mean degree of skill in mechanism. At the dispersion nations were first formed, and so numerous was each colony, that the collective body in every distinct country possessed all the knowledge of the primitive world, with the ever accumulating improvements of the new. Thus must the knowledge of the most useful arts have been coeval with the dispersion.

† Chron. p. 14.

B b

escaped

escaped the memory of the inhabitants. Thus if the Argive era were near three centuries prior in time to the Attic, as Sir John Marsham has fixed the origin of both, the transactions of those intermediate centuries could not be preserved to the time of Cadmus *. For Sir I. Newton lays down this fundamental principle, "Before the use of letters, the names and actions of men, could scarce be remembered above 80 or 100 years after their deaths †." By the same rule are the actions of Cadmus himself unsupported by historical evidence. According to Josephus, the Greeks themselves admitted, that the laws of Draco concerning murders, were the most ancient of their public records; and Draco, he says, lived but a short time before the tyrant Pisistratus ‡. From Cadmus to Pisistratus is a period of almost five centuries beyond the era of authentic history.

THAT article of the Short Chronicle, (B. Chr. 1080.) which makes the two brothers Ægialeus and Phoroneus,

* The illustrious author foresaw this objection, and had the precaution to ward off its force by introducing Lycaon, Phoroneus, Cecrops, and Cadmus, *about the same time*. This artifice perplexes his reckoning by generations: Agenor, an exile from Egypt, became king of Phœnicia; whence he imposed the name Phoenix on his eldest son. His brother Cadmus, emigrated thence into Greece, where he built a city, and founded Thebes, the capital of Bœotia. This expedition is with the greatest probability connected with the time of Samuel the prophet, 50 years earlier than the date assigned in *The Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended*.

† Chron. Introd. p. 7.

‡ Apion, i. 4.

the

the founders of Sicyon and Argus, in the same year rectifies that mistake, in the Old Chronology, which inserts 11 or 12 nominal kings of Sicyon between the two sons of Inachus, now mentioned; and the years, assigned to these feigned kings, abridge the computation by three centuries*.

THIS discovery is important. But the age of Inachus, the father of Ægialeus and Phoroneus, still remains undefined. Sir J. Marsham affirms that Inachus was a river, not a man†. Syncellus says, that Inachus and his son Phoroneus, were the most ancient kings in Greece; and it is well known, that the poets usually derived those kings, of whose ancestors tradition had not preserved the names, from a river, or a god. In the Short Chronicle Cadmus is said to have brought a Phenician colony into Greece 120 years before the voyage of Danaus with his 50 daughters from Egypt. This last date, by the same chronicle, is 964 before our era, or 529 subsequent to the Exodus. This computation brings that expedition too low. Josephus, in a passage already quoted, with much more probability affirms, that the Israelites left Egypt 393 years before the reign of Danaus in Argus. But this is not the sole objection to the poetical, or rather fictitious, plantations of Egyptian colonies in Greece. Dr. Musgrave, comparing minutely the usages civil, domestic, and religious, of the two countries, pronounces them totally dissimilar; and hence he concludes

* Introduction, p. 7.

† Chron. Canon, p. 15.

that the Greeks were, in general, natives of their own soil ; that their religion and mythology were radically, if not entirely their own ; that they resented as an indignity the report that Cecrops was a foreigner ;— and also affirmed that Cadmus, Danaus, and Pelops, were the first strangers who had settled among them *.

THIS censure detracts from the credit of Strabo, D. Siculus, and others, on whose authority Marsham contends, that Greece was peopled by colonies from Egypt under Phoroneus and Cecrops ; but does not affect the scheme of Sir I. Newton, who uniformly represents the ancestors of such leaders, as strangers and intruders, in that country ; and themselves as fugitives, expelled by force. Exceptionable indeed is his notion, that Danaus was the brother of Sefac, and Sefac the same with Sesostris, as is already shewn. For if Sesostris returned into Egypt, in the 14th of Rehoboam ; and Danaus set out on his voyage to Argos, as Josephus testifies, 393 years after the Exodus, the interval is 260 years, a period incompatible with the doctrine of Sir I. Newton.

SUCH are the imperfections in the plan and execution of this great man's chronology. A specimen only has, for the sake of brevity, been selected. Candor and equity demand a concise view of the improvements peculiar to this his last bequest, which, with all its defects, would alone have been sufficient to consecrate his memory.

* Dissert. on Gr. Mythology.

C H A P. III.

FIXED PERIODS ascertained by SIR I. NEWTON.

BY the light of philosophy have spots been discovered on the sun's disc. But these impair not the manifold beneficial uses of that glorious luminary. Sir Isaac Newton was born, in an enlightened age, for the advancement of science, and his comprehensive mind either adorned or exhausted every subject of investigation. It is not surprising, that the same masterly genius, which gave the stamp and seal of certainty to many abstruse problems, susceptible of demonstration, or experiment, should deduce unsatisfactory conclusions, either from uncertain principles, or from modes of proof, which result in degrees of probability inferior to infallible evidence.

If this wonderful proficient in scientific skill, did not untwist all the perplexities, in the art of computing times, it cannot be denied, that he improved and adorned the subject by conjecturing shrewdly concerning the true date of several important events, which lay far beyond the line of historical time, and by combining a train of proofs, sufficient to induce the conviction, that his conjectures were JUST ; e. g.

B b 3

1. WHO,

I. WHO, WHEN, and WHENCE, the PASTOR-KINGS in EGYPT?

THE solution of these queries has long been an engine of torture, to the most profound adepts in the mysteries of computation, and the subject is still under an arrest of judgment. Of these ambiguous personages the earliest account is a fragment of Manetho, preserved by Josephus, in the 14th section of his first book against Apion. It is in substance as follows.

“Under an Egyptian king, Timaus, a multitude from the East invaded the country, slew some of the inhabitants, enslaved others, burnt the cities, demolished the temples, and committed all manner of hostilities. At length they made Salatis, one of their number, king, who reigned at Memphis, and made both the upper and lower regions tributary. He had five successors, whose reigns amounted to about 254 years. After them succeeded another dynasty, who kept possession of Egypt 511 years,” in which sum the former number is probably included. It is added, “That the kings of Thebais, and of the other sovereignties, raised a war against the shepherds, who were subdued, and shut up in a place called Abaris, where they fortified themselves, in the reign of Alisphragmosis; under whose son, Thummosis, they agreed to evacuate the country. They passed from Egypt through Syria, and built Jerusalem in Judea.”

THESE invaders might have come from the East, but every feature in the picture disproves the wild supposition

tion of Josephus, that they were none others than the Fathers of the XII. Tribes. Than the specified characters of time, nothing can be more vague. In that strange, inexplicable record, The Dynasties, Timaus is the name of no one sovereign; and the same may be said of Alisphragmosis and Thummosis. By no certain test can the interval be defined.

USHER brings these usurpers from Arabia, Bedford from Canaan, and both agree in fixing the time of the invasion to A. M. 1920, or about 90 years before Abraham. This term encroaches on the time of the general dispersion, prior to which no kingdoms were erected, and consequently no revolutions possible. Allow 500 years for the two dynasties, the time of the lasting war raised against them by all the confederated kings in Egypt was about 95 years before the Exodus. But every memorial from the birth of Abraham to the end of the 430 years sojourning, represents Egypt as one monarchy. The Israelites, and the Pastor-kings, both possessed the Lower Egypt, but not at the same time. If the Pastor-kings were expelled before the Israelites arrived, the former must have seized the country before the separation from Babel. Thus temples are said to have been demolished before they were built, and empires overturned before their existence.

CUMBERLAND, after a very tedious disquisition, maintains, that these shepherds were Phenicians, descendants from Canaan, the first planter of Palestine, connects their expulsion with the Argive era, about the

56th year of Isaac's life; that is, 508 years after the flood. By this reckoning, they invaded Egypt about the time of Arphaxad's birth or infancy! What a palpable absurdity?

SHUCKFORD conjectures, that these shepherds were the inhabitants about Mount Hor, whom the grandchildren of Esau expelled their country, in the time of Jacob's grandchildren. This author places the usurpation of Salatis somewhere between the death of Joseph, and the birth of Moses, and affirms, that the cruelties said to have been done by this tyrant, against the kings and native subjects of Egypt, were inflicted on the Israelites. He is the new king, who knew not Joseph. But it is not recorded, that Esau, or his descendants, conquered, much less expelled the Horites; and least of all, that the refugees made an inroad into Egypt, and subdued the country. This is fiction not history.

OF all the conjectures on this intricate subject, that of Sir I. Newton alone derives confirmation from history. "The Canaanites who fled from Joshua, retired in great numbers into Egypt, conquered the lower country, and reigned under their kings, Salatis, &c. until the days of Eli and Samuel *." The proofs, with their authorities, are set forth in the larger work, p. 198—202.

SEVERAL infallible characters of time restrict the conquest of Canaan to the 45th year from the release

* Short Chron. page 9.

out of Egypt ; and though considerable numbers might have taken refuge in that country, during the four past years, this may be considered as the last date of the migration. Eli's magistracy began in the year from the egress 319. From the greater number take the less, the surplus 274, denotes the interval. Manetho and Syncellus, agreeing nearly with Josephus, as his numbers are now expressed, assign 260 years to the first dynasty of the Pastor-kings from Salatis to Assis ; and this sum deducted from 274, leaves 14 years for the return of the first refugees into Canaan. This remainder indicates the 14th prior to Eli's administration, coincident with the 9th of Tolah.

ALL the other schemes of adjusting this fragment of the Egyptian Chronology to the Sacred History, are awkward, fortuitous, inefficient ; exemplifying licentiousness of conjecture, incompatible with physical probability, and repugnant to the state of the world. Sir I. Newton's hypothesis rests on the report of authentic history, and discovers a felicity of genius in ascertaining both the origin and period of this otherwise equivocal dynasty.

2. *The rise of the ASSYRIAN EMPIRE is placed too high by all the ancient, and the greater part of the modern writers.*

“ As the deified kings or princes of Greece, Egypt, and Syria of Damascus, have been made much antienter than the truth, so have those of Chaldea and Assyria: for Diodorus tells us, that, when Alexander the

the Great was in Asia, the Chaldeans reckoned 473,000 years since they first began to observe the stars; and Ctesias, with the other Greek and Latin authors, who copy from him, have made the Assyrian Empire as old as Noah's Flood within 60 or 70 years, and tell us the names of all the kings in Assyria from Belus to Sardanapalus. But the names of his kings have no affinity, (except two or three), with the names of the Assyrians mentioned in scripture.—Ctesias supposes, that the Assyrian Empire was at an end 250 years before it began.”

“HOWEVER, we must allow, that Nimrod founded a kingdom at Babylon, and perhaps extended it into Assyria, but this kingdom was of small extent, if compared with the empires which rose up afterwards; being only confined within the fertile plains of Chaldea, Chalonitis, and Assyria, watered by the Tigris and Euphrates: and, if it had been greater, it could not have continued long, it being the custom, in those early ages, for every father to divide his territories among his sons *.”

SIR Isaac having taken notice, p. 269, that no more is heard of an Assyrian Empire, from the days of Nimrod to those of Pul, proceeds to shew, in a multitude of instances, from the Sacred History, that various provinces of this large sovereignty, were, during that protracted interval, under the dominion of sundry independent kings: and his conclusion is, “In the reign

* Chron. ch. iii. p. 267.

of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, the Assyrian Empire seems arrived at its greatness, being united under one monarch, and containing Assyria, Media, Apolloniatis, Susiana, Chaldea, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Syria, Phœnicia, Egypt, Ethiopia, and part of Arabia, and reaching Eastward into Elymais, and Parætacene, a province of the Medes : and if Chalach and Chabor, be Colchis and Iberia, as some think, we are also to add these two provinces, with the two Armenias, Pontus, and Cappadocia, as far as to the river Halys : for Herodotus tells us, that the people of Cappadocia, as far as to that river, were called Syrians, by the Greeks, both before and after the days of Cyrus, and that the Assyrians were also called Syrians by the Greeks *.”

THESE decisive geographical notations, confirmed by so many apposite and direct testimonies from the sacred Oracles, authenticate this illustrious writer's hypothesis, “ That the Empire of Assyria was first founded at Nineveh, by Pul, about the year before Christ 790, and destroyed by Cyaxares and Nebuchadnezzar in 609, after it had stood 180 years.” Were singularity of opinion an infallible symptom of erroneous judgement, easy it were to defend Sir I. Newton from this charge. Not to mention other competent judges, Mr. W. Jameson, Professor of History in the University of Glasgow, published, so early as 1720, his *SPICILEGIA antiquitatum Ægypti atque ei vicinarum GENTIUM* : in which very exquisite specimen of

* Chron. p. 283.

Oriental learning is suggested, and ably maintained, Sir I. Newton's scheme of the Assyrian monarchy, in its late origin, wide extent, and short duration *.

THE date of the Argonautic expedition, and of the Heraclidæ recovering a settlement in the Peloponnesus, Sir I. Newton has fixed, with great probability, on the unanimous report of traditional history. These events are valuable no otherwise, than by their subservience to determine the following epoch.

3. *The overthrow of TROY seems probably connected with the reign of JEHOSHAPHAT in Judah, and of AHAB in Israel.*

FROM the royal calendar, in Jerusalem and Samaria, certain it is, that these were contemporary princes ;—that Ahab married Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, or Itho-baal, king of Zidon ;—and that Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, married Athaliah, the daughter of Jezebel. Thus is the genealogy of the Hebrews intermixed with that of the Tyrians.

ETHBAAL was the great-grandfather of Dido, the sister of Pygmalion. “Virgil, and his scholiast Servius, who might have some things from the archives of Tyre and Cyprus, as well as from those of Carthage, relate, that Teucer came from the war of Troy to Cyprus, in the days of Dido, a little before the reign of her brother Pygmalion, and in conjunction with

* This elaborate piece of ancient criticism is now seldom seen. Those to whom it is accessible, may consult chap. iii. and iv.

her father, seized Cyprus, and ejected Cinyras : and the marbles say, that Teucer came to Cyprus seven years after the destruction of Troy, and built Salamis. If, therefore, the Romans, in the days of Augustus, followed not altogether the artificial chronology of Eratosthenes, but had these things from the records of Carthage, Cyprus, or Tyre, the arrival of Teucer at Cyprus will be in the reign of the predecessor of Pygmalion, and by consequence, the destruction of Troy about 76 years later than the death of Solomon *."

It is to be noted, that Teucer, the son of Telamon, king of Salamis, an island on the southern coast of Attica, having incurred his father's displeasure, because he had not brought back from Troy his brother Ajax, was refused an asylum in his native soil. But encouraged by an oracle, he pointed his course to Cyprus, where he built the new Salamis, and became a pattern of successful enterprize, too eminent to escape the renown arising from the records of poetical heroism.

———Teucer Salamina patremque
 Cum fugeret, tamen uda Lyæo
 Tempora populeâ fertur vinxisse coronâ
 Sic tristes affectus amicos :
 Quo nos cunque feret melior fortuna parente
 Irimus O socii comitesque, &c. HOR. Odes, i. 7.
 When Teucer from his fire and country fled,
 With poplar leaves the hero crown'd his head,

Reeking with wine, and thus his friends address,
 Deep sorrow brooding in each anxious breast ;
 Bold let us follow through the foamy tides,
 Where fortune, better than a father, guides.
 Avaunt despair ! when Teucer calls to fame,
 The same your Augur, and your guide the same.
 Another Salamis in foreign clime,
 With rival pride shall raise her head sublime,
 So Phoebus nods ; ye sons of valour true,
 Full often tried in deeds of deadlier hue,
 To-day with wine drive every care away,
 To-morrow tempt again the boundless sea.

FRANCIS.

VIRGIL much more pertinently specifies the time, and describes contemporary personages. In the subjoined passage Dido is introduced informing Æneas, that she had seen Teucer on his voyage, cruising along the coast of Sidon.

—— Teucrum memini Sidona venire,
 Finibus expulsum patriis, nova regna petentem
 Auxilio Beli. Genitor tum Belus opimam
 Vastabat Cyprum, et victor ditione tenebat.
 Tempore jam ex illo casus mihi cognitus urbis
 Trojanæ, nomenque tuum, regesque Pelasgi.

ÆNEID, i. 623.

—— Now I call to mind,
 When Teucer left his native shores behind ;
 The banish'd prince to Sidon came, to gain
 Great Belus' aid, to fix him in his reign ;

Then the rich Cyprian isle, my warlike fire,
 Subdu'd with hostile sword and vengeful fire.
 From him I learn'd the Grecian kings of fame,
 The fall of Ilion, and your glorious name. PITT.

IN the works of Josephus, and of Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, are happily preserved two extracts from the Tyrian Chronicle, of Menander the Ephesian, who compiled with great diligence and no less judgement, an history both of the Greeks and Barbarians, on the authority of genuine records*. A relick of pagan antiquity so curious, authentic, and subservient, to connect the sacred history with that of the gentiles, merits special regard, as affording various articles of important intelligence relative to the fabulous ages, and as being the only fragment now extant of a once large chronicle. It is here exhibited at one view together with the co-existent reigns in Jerusalem and Samaria.

* See Josephus, Apion, i. 18. and Theophil. Apolog. Engl. edit. 1722. p. 288. This fragment, in its two copies, varies occasionally in the orthography of names, and in partial numbers; but both agree in the order of succession, and general sums.

On the authority of the ancient Prolate, 8 years, not 6, as in Josephus, are assigned to the reign of Badozoar, son of Ethbaal. The larger number is here preferred, because every probability brings the conflagration of Troy, and the rise of Salamis, into coincidence with the reign of Pygmalion's father.

Years

Years from the IIId of Solomon and XIth of Hiram,
both excluded, to the death of Pygmalion.

JUDAH.		SAMARIA.		SIDON.		A. M. 2994.	
Solomon	4	found the Temple	Hiram	12	1		
	23			34	23		
	30		Beleazar	7	30		
	36		Abdaftart	6	36		
Rehoboam	3	Jeroboam I.	3	9	39		
	15		15 Anonymus	12	51		
	17		17 Aftart	2	53		
Abijah	3		20	5	56		
Aza	2		22	7	58		
	3	Baasha	1	8	59		
	7		5	12	63		
	16		14 Aserymus	9	72		
	17		15 Pheles	1	73		
	26		24 Itnobaal	9	82		
	27	Omri	1	10	83		
	38	Ahab	1 12	21	94		
	39		2	22	95		
	40		3	23	96		
Jehoshaphat	1 41		4	24	97		
	2		5	25	98		
	9		12	32	105		
	17		20	8	113		
Troy overthrown	18		21	1	114		
	19		22	2	115		
Jehoshaphat	20	Ahaziah	1	3	116		
	21		2	4	117		
	22	Joram	1	5	118		
	23		2	6	119		
	24		3	7	120		
Jehoram	1 25	Teucer builds	4	8	121		
	2		5	9	122		
	3		6	1	123		
	4		7	2	124		
	5		8	3	125		
	6		9	4	126		
	7		10	5	127		
Ahaziah	8		11	6	128		
	1	Dido fails	12	7	129		
Athaliah	1	Jehu	1	8	130		
	2		2	9	131		
	3	Foundation of	3	10	132		
	4		4	11	133		
Jehoash	34	Jehoahaz	12	36	169		

A. M. 3163.

THIS

THIS Table combines the Phenician with the Hebrew Annals, during the lapse of 180 years, ending A. M. 3163, which is the 69th before the first Olympiad.

THE primary end of inserting it here was to vindicate and confirm the computation of Sir I. Newton, who, by various methods of proof, establishes the conclusion, that Troy was overthrown about the 76th or 78th year from the demise of Solomon. From all the three columns, it is intuitively obvious, that this prince died in the 36th year after the foundation of the Temple, co-incident with A. M. 3030; for $2994 + 36 = 3030$. It is equally evident, that the catastrophe of Troy stands in chronological connexion with the 114th from the foundation of the Temple, A. M. 3108: the 1st of Matgenus, the father of Dido, the 21st of Ahab, and the 18th of Jehoshaphat;—precisely the 78th from the demise of Solomon: or nearly three centuries subsequent to the old erroneous chronology.

THE ancient writers, Thucydides, Dion. of Halicarnassus, &c. define the date of some events by a determinate number of years prior to the fall of Troy, as the expedition of the Argonauts; others by a posterior term, as the return of the Heraclidæ, the origin of Rome, &c. But such vague arrangements explain nothing; because the term of computation, or fixed point, supposed to be universally well known, is itself involved in obscurity impenetrable.

THE author last mentioned, with all the solemn formalities of indefectible precision, informs his readers, that “Ilium was taken, at the end of the spring, on

the 8th day before the end of Thargelion, according to the Athenian Calendar, and 17 days before the summer solstice *.” The year of no national era is expressed ; nor was it possible. At the time when Troy was buried under her own ashes, the Olympiad had not become a chronological epoch, Rome was not built, Nabonassar, yet unborn, was not the subject of history. The notations, specified by this learned Historian are astronomical ; and by his reckoning the summer solstice fell on the 12th day of the month July, in the Julian year of the World 2823, almost three centuries, as already noted, before the true date of that memorable catastrophe.

THIS fixed period, suppose it marked with every possible criterion of scientific truth, if absolutely considered, is *frivolous* ; but, if with reference to events prior, co-existent, or more recent, *important*. That, in this latter view, Sir Isaac understood such historical incidents as the Argonautic expedition, the overthrow of Troy, the regress of the Heraclidæ into Peloponnesus, &c. is naturally inferred from his own very judicious remark ; “ These periods, being settled, become the foundation for building on them the chronology of ancient times, and, for settling this chronology, nothing more remains to make these periods a little exacter, if it can be, and to shew how the rest of the antiquities in Greece, Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, and Media, may suit therewith †.”

* Dion. Hal. Rom. Antiq. B. i. C. 63.

† Chron. p. 126.

THE illustrious author might have included Phœnicia, whence he supposes, “ that the Sidonians, in the 15th of David’s reign, or thereabout, emigrated under Abibalus, Cadmus, Cilix, Thafus, Membliarius, Atymnus, and other captains, to Tyre, Aradus, Cilicia, Rhodes, Caria, Bithynia, Phrygia, Calliste, Thafus, Samothrace, Crete, Greece, and Libya*.” To the same age is referred the building of Tyre, Thebes, &c.

IN this passage Abibalus is affirmed to have been a fugitive from Sidon. But in the fragment from Menander, it is said, that he died and was succeeded by his son Hiram, who, with his descendants, kept possession of the throne, at least two centuries, from the accession of Abibalus, to whom Marshall in his Chronological Tables assigns a reign of 19 years, prior to the sole administration of Hiram. On this hypothesis Abibalus was made king of Sidon in the 12th of David. His predecessor was Agenor, the father of Cadmus, whose elder brother Phœnix, having been born in the country, was called by its name. Cadmus and Phœnix were certainly coeval with Danaus, because he had a daughter, Amydone, by their sister Europa. Marsham dates the migration of Cadmus from Phœnicia, about 10 years earlier than that of Danaus from Egypt; though he connects the arrival of both in Greece nearly with the time of the Exodus. The authority of Josephus has already been mentioned, stating that the Israelites left

* p. 105.

Egypt 393 years before that expedition of Danaus : and the same writer asserts, that Tyre was built 240 years before Solomon's temple. Both these notations are more probable, as less incongruous with genealogy and history, than the reckoning in the *Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended*.

IF Sir I. Newton's assigned term for the downfall of Troy disagree with his own arrangements for the rise of the Bœotian Thebes, and the Phenecian Tyre, it harmonises with the history of the age to which it is referred. A few instances are subjoined.

1. THE three years of dearth foretold by Elijah in the days of Ahab is recorded, in the fragment from Menander, to have happened in the reign of Ethbaal king of Tyre, and father of Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, king of Israel *.

2. WITH the termination of the Trojan war is connected the history of Athens, and the other Grecian states; for that city surrendered in the 22d of Menestheus, Archon of Athens †.

3. THE father of Pygmalion and Dido was known by sundry names, Agenor, Belus, Matgenus, Mettes, not to mention other variations; but his history is signalised by two notable events, the fall of Troy in the first, and the rise of New Salamis in the 8th of his reign.

* Compare 1 Kings, xvi. 31. and chapters, xvii. xviii. with Josephus, Ant. B. viii. ch. xiii. 1, 2.

† Par. Chron. Epoch. 25.

4. **SUNDRY** memorable incidents distinguish the reign of Pygmalion, e. g. ; in his 7th year the flight of his sister Dido ;—the execution of Jezebel, of Ahaziah and Joram, kings of Jerusalem and Samaria ;—and that revolution which brought Athaliah and Jehu each to a vacant throne ;—in the 10th the foundation of New Carthage. Obvious is the use of chronological characters, so numerous, so decisive, and all crowded into so narrow a compass, that they derive mutual elucidation from contiguity of time, and co-existent personages.

5. By a singular felicity of conjecture, which sometimes reconciles apparent contradictions in historical records, has Sir Isaac rectified that notorious anachronism, which ignorance, and false erudition have laid to the charge of Virgil, in asserting, that Æneas was coeval with Dido. Those of the critics who affect the greatest indulgence to this poet's reputation as an accurate chronologer and genealogist, offer two apologies for this confusion of times, events, and characters. Some of them kindly allege the plea of ignorance in the antiquities and history of Tyre. This apology our very learned author repels, by evincing that both Virgil and his commentator Servius, not only had access to the archives of Tyre, Cyprus, and Carthage, but affirm, with the accuracy of historians, the co-existence of Teucer, Æneas, and Dido, about the period of the Trojan war. Others admit the poet's skill in the chronology and history of Troy, Tyre, and Africa, but suppose that he had recourse, for the sake of embellishment, to a poetical licence. This feeble effort,

to save the poet's credit, betrays the ignorance, and injudicious zeal of his friends, the critics. That he needed no such jejune defences, has fully been shewn in a learned dissertation on the subject *.

It must however, be owned, that Virgil was in part misled by the *old* artificial chronology, particularly in giving the sanction of infallibility to that oracle, which foretold a reign of 300 years to the kings of Alba, his conducting Æneas to Carthage in the 7th year of his voyages †, that is, 8 years prior to the flight of Dido from Tyre, and full four years after his own death. But these deviations from historical truth do not affect the credibility of the fact, that this hero and heroine were contemporary; which they might be, on the supposition that they never had an interview.

* See Dissertations, and critical Remarks, on the Æneid of Virgil, by John Martyn, F. R. S. Lond. 1770. In the first Dissertation, Sir I. Newton's arguments are happily illustrated and confirmed.

† ——— Te jam septima portat

Omnibus errantem terris et fluctibus æstas. Æneid, i. 759.

Here the 7th summer from the conflagration of Troy is specified. But in a former passage of the same Book, v. 269. Jupiter promises to Æneas, in the oracular stile, a reign of three years after his arrival in Latium:

Tertia dum Latio regnantem viderat æstas,

Ternaque transferint Rutulis hiberna subactis.

If these three years be added to the 7th from the date of this expedition, he must have survived the fall of Troy 10 years; a period incompatible with that history, or rather tradition, which assigns but seven years to his life after that catastrophe. See Marshall's Chron. Tables, 1184. before the Christian era.

6. "WHEN the Romans conquered the Carthaginians, the archives of Carthage came into their hands ; and thence Appian, in his history of the Punic wars, tells, in round numbers, that Carthage stood 700 years. Solinus adds the odd number 37. It was destroyed in the consulship of Lentulus and Mummus, A. P. Jul. 4568 ; whence count backwards 737 years, and the Encœnia or Dedication of the city, will fall upon the 16th year of Pygmalion, the brother of Dido, and king of Tyre *." With all deference be it suggested, that, if from 4568, be subtracted 737, the remainder 3831, will denote the number of the Julian Period, coincident with the first of Carthage ; and, by the Table, its foundation was laid in the 10th of Pygmalion, and 18th from the catastrophe of Troy. In this one character of times, Sir I. Newton's intuitive perspicacity seems to have failed. This great man refers to no historical voucher, in support of his position, that the years of Carthage were anciently reckoned from the dedication of the city, and not from the date of the first building. History justifies this computation in no other instance, and does not mention this, as an exception from a general rule. From the sole authority of this eminent writer has the hypothesis derived traditional credit. But probable circumstances remonstrate. Necessity, not choice, induced Dido to undertake that expedition, of which safety, not empire, was the primary object. She launched with a few ships, indif-

* Chron. p. 65.

ferently manned, and found it necessary to disembark at Cyprus, where, having acquired a reinforcement, she resumed the voyage, landed on the African coast, and having ratified commercial treaties with the natives, formed at last the project of erecting a fortress *. The foundation of Byrsa is, in the table, referred to the third year after her expedition from Tyre, precisely 737 prior to the desolation of the city by Scipio. Sir I. Newton seems to have fallen into an egregious mistake, when he reckons from the 16th of Pygmalion, A. P. Jul. 3837, for the interval hence to the desolation of Carthage, is but 731, instead of 737.

THIS era, the downfall of Troy, so very memorable in the mythology of Greece, yet so inaccurately defined by chronological notations in the annals of the Gentiles, Sir Isaac Newton has ascertained by the various, but combined operations of astronomy, chronology, genealogy, and history. The result of such multiplied experiments is, that Troy was reduced to desolation A. M. 3108; 124 years before the restoration of the Olympiads by Iphitus, and 18 prior to the foundation of Carthage by Dido.

THE discovery of a source for computation in the times antecedent to the epoch of astronomical chronology among the gentiles, similar to the Christian era, (a term peculiarly and exquisitely subservient for connecting the history of the Old Testament with that of the New, and, in certain periods of time, the

* Justin. lib. xviii. 4—6.

sacred with the profane), is a valuable acquisition to the stock of general knowledge, for which the present and succeeding generations are, and will be, indebted to the patient industry, and exploring genius, of the incomparable Sir I. NEWTON. * The application of this fixed term, to the times before and after the Fall of Troy, is reserved for the subject of the ensuing chapter.

* Mr. Martyn, in that morsel of exquisite criticism, the Dissertation above quoted, defends Virgil in points not necessary to the truth of computation, and which history cannot admit. Æneas reigned four years together with Latinus, and three more after his colleague's decease. He therefore died about the end of the seventh year from the fall of Troy, and consequently before Dido's retreat from Tyre. This author's concluding remark is judicious. 'Every impartial reader will be satisfied that Virgil is acquitted from the anachronism laid to his charge. Had Sir I. Newton undertaken professedly to vindicate Virgil, we might have suspected, that he was blinded by partiality to that great poet; but as that is not the case, we must look upon him as an impartial judge, and may observe with pleasure, that as Virgil is undesigneally justified, so the authority of that noble poet confirms this amendment of ancient chronology, by our great philosopher.'

C H A P. IV.

The Subject continued.

OF many ancient cities, once populous, and the seats of empire, arts, commerce, legislation ; so very singular has been the fate, that the spots, where some stood, and the times when others rose or fell, have long since become the subject of controversy among antiquaries. In fable, and in history, Babel, Memphis, Thebes, and Troy, have, for ages past, been obsolete names, besides which no memorial remains. By comparing together a few notations of times and pedigrees, still extant in the records of past ages, subservient to connect the Tyrian Annals with those of the Hebrews and Greeks, Sir I. Newton acquired the honour of a discovery, much more valuable, than would have been the restoration of Troy from her ruins, projected by the first two Cæsars.

CENSORINUS, and the other ancient writers who ventured to define the interval from the Fall of Troy to the first Olympiad, waver in their opinions, and pronounce with uncertainty. The least specified number is 395, the greatest 436 : but the intermediate space, according to Sir I. Newton, did not exceed 125. No

other arrangement admits so many and decisive signatures of credibility. If this date be considered as an infallible chronological character, and as the center of computation for prior and subsequent occurrences, future chronologers may, perhaps with success, rest their engines on this fulcrum, and eventually rectify certain hypotheses assumed, and conclusions educed, in the Newtonian chronology. An experiment, for a sample, may now be tried.

It has, with every colour of probability, been assumed, that 17 Utopian kings in Sicyon, before Epopeus, ought to be retrenched, because this list makes Ægialeus, its first founder, 300 years older than his brother Phoroneus. Marsham, biassed in favour of the Old Chronology, places the Argive era 260 years higher than the Attic; and consequently Phoroneus as long before Cecrops I. This computation Sir I. Newton virtually reprobates, by assigning almost one common date to the capital cities, Argos, Sicyon, and Athens*.

CADMUS and Danaus have generally been reckoned coeval with the Exodus. Sir Isaac refers the expedition of the former into Greece to the 14th or 16th of David's reign, and that of the latter to the 14th of Rehoboam. The interval is 80 years. Europa, the sister of Cadmus, is said to have been the mother of Amymône, one of Danaus's 50 daughters. This disproportion of age brings suspicion on the reckoning.

* Short Chronicle, 1080.

Sir I. Newton's zeal to abbreviate the extravagant computations of the untutored, and vain glorious gentiles, induced him in this, and several other cases, to overshoot the mark.

Reasons for anticipating the time of Danaus.

HIRAM's accession to the throne of Sidon must have been coincident with the 31st of David, because the 12th of Hiram was the 4th of Solomon. Marshall's Tables assign a reign of 19 years to Abibalus, whose predecessor seems to have been Phœnix, the son of Agenor, and brother of Cadmus and Europa. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, testifies from documents extant in his time, that the Israelites left Egypt 316 years before Danaus went to Argos. Josephus, quoting the same author, Manetho, and adding the same remarks, enlarges the interval to 393 ; so that Danaus emigrated from Egypt to Argos 136 years before the 14th of Rehoboam, and with this date the arrival of Cadmus in Bœotia agrees. Other circumstances confirm this arrangement. No vestige of alphabetical composition before Moses is either proved or probable. The Phœnicians acquired this art from their near neighbours, the Hebrews ; and after the lapse of four centuries almost, it is supposable that Cadmus might import the discovery into Greece. That he actually did, is the uniform report of fable, tradition, history, or whatever evidence it was, which propagated the universal opinion of antiquity. In Greece, as in other countries, slow was the reception, and partial the progress,

gress, of an art, so happily adapted for the expedition, and ease, of correspondence ; not to mention its use in perpetuating the records of memorable deeds. One reason is obvious ; the imperfect state of mechanical knowledge, in framing the instruments and materials for writing, with facility, compositions of a moderate size, and portable weight. But whatever were the obstacles to the speedy and diffusive use of written language, the only example in Homer of a missive letter, in Greece, prior to the Trojan war, is that of Prætus king of Argos, committed to Bellerophon *. Prætus was the third in descent from Danaus, and might be coeval with Solomon. Long after the conclusion of that war, so few were written compositions, that Lycurgus first imported from Crete into Greece, a manuscript copy of Homer's poems.

Origin of Hero worship in Greece.

DR. Winder, in his Chronological and Critical History of Knowledge, in its rise, progress, declension, and revival, from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to Christ, shews that idolatry was not introduced before the general dispersion ; which memorable occurrence this author brings considerably lower than his predecessors in sacred computation. Of his xiith chap. Idolatry in its several kinds is the subject ;—the worship of visible and invisible beings, as the luminaries and demons, plants and animals ;—last of all dead men. In

* Iliad, vi. 169.

chap. xv. it is evinced that hero-gods, images in human shape, and the distinction of sex, among the pagan deities, were entirely unknown, in Egypt and Greece, at least before the giving of the law to the Israelites.

THEOPHILUS of Antioch, to whom references, concerning the antiquities of the profane Gentiles, are so often repeated, solemnly attests that the holy scriptures, and the giving of the law to Moses, were much more ancient than Lycurgus, Solon, Minos, the reign of Jupiter in Crete, and even the war of Troy *.

It is to be kept in mind, that Saturn, Jupiter, Apollo, Juno, Vesta, Ceres, &c. were once mortals; and by the superstition and ignorance of posterity, their own descendants, in the line of sovereignty especially, obtained divine honours after death. Jupiter, with his brothers and sisters, consistently with many presumptive circumstances scarcely inferior to certainty, was coeval with Cadmus and Danaus. For Cadmus was the brother of Europa, whom Jupiter, (to speak without the aid of fiction), conveyed by sea from Phœnicia into Crete.

APOLLO, Neptune, and Pluto, were the brothers of Jupiter; Neptune, by Amymône, the daughter of Danaus, became the Father of Nauplius, and thus is the co-existence of Jupiter with Danaus ascertained.

SIR Isaac Newton, by an intuitive sagacity, referred the origin of Argos, Sicyon, and Athens, to one com-

* Apolog. 290.

mon term. With respect to Athens in particular, it is recorded, that Minerva acquired the preference to Neptune in giving name to the new city, built by Cecrops. In the reign of Cranaus about 50 years after its foundation, a certain criminal process, in a trial for murder, shewed the genealogy of the families concerned, at that period of time. Mars, a son of Jupiter and Juno, was, it is alleged, the first culprit arraigned at the Areopagus, for the murder of Hallirotius, who, it seems, had attempted to violate the purity of Alcippe, the defendant's daughter. In this trial Neptune was the prosecutor, because Hallirotius had been his son*. Mars was absolved by the 12 judges, who, after death, were accounted 12 gods.

To the cities, built about the same time, Troy might have been added, were it not much more probable that its origin was a great deal more ancient. The tradition is, that Scamander transplanted the first colony from Crete into Phrygia, long before the golden age, or reign of Saturn. To his successor Teucer no memorable deeds are assigned, and no years specified for his reign. From Dardanus to Priam, including both, are 6 reigns, extending to 307 years. This sum taken from 3108, the year of Troy's fall, leaves a remainder of 2801 years, reaching back to more than a century before the inauguration of Saul, and also before the existence of Cadmus, Danaus, or Jupiter. As the desolation of this city transcends the era of a true chronology, so

* See Pausanias, lib. i. ch. 28.

the date of its rise lies beyond the most remote source of pagan history. The kings in Phrygia were older than the gods in Greece. Laomedon the father of Priam, having employed Apollo and Neptune in repairing the walls of his capital, defrauded them of their reward, which indignity provoked Jupiter to accomplish its destruction in the next reign.

By a strict attention to physical probability, textual connexion, historical consistence, parallel records, various readings, and ancient versions, it has been attempted to rectify incidental mistakes in the chronology and genealogy of the sacred writings. In the Newtonian computations are many undoubted improvements, which had escaped the scrutiny of the Christian Fathers, and such masterly critics of later times, as Petau, Scaliger, Usher, &c.—improvements, exquisitely subservient to giving order and form to the discordant annals of paganism; and it is now proposed to correct the mistakes intermingled with the very construction of the New Chronology, assuming for a source in reckoning the date assigned by Sir I. Newton for the catastrophe of Troy. A specimen has likewise been given, connecting the origin of the Greek theology with the times of Cadmus and Danaus:—an experiment hitherto unattempted, with acknowledged success.

Objections.

1. “ To the six reigns in Phrygia, prior to the conflagration of Troy, is assigned a period of 307 years, (the mean quantity being 51), disproportionate by excess

to the course of nature." Answer. In the foregoing Analysis it has been evinced, that the period of natural life was not reduced to the present standard before David, till whose time men generally lived 100, or 110. To the first three Trojan kings, Dardanus, Erichthonius, and Tros, is severally marked a reign of 31, 75, and 60 years, the last ending about the 26th of David's reign. The other three were in part co-existent with David, Solomon, and Aſa, whose reigns amounted to 120, or 40 years a-piece. This disproportion is inconsiderable. In a more advanced period of the kings in Judah, the reigns of Joash, Amaziah, and Manasseh, were 40, 52, and 55.

2. *Objection.*

"IF Jupiter, Apollo, and Neptune, were men, of mature age, in the times assigned to Cadmus and Danaus, they must have been either superannuated, or dead, at the siege of Troy, after the lapse of two centuries." It is replied, Who expects to find coherence, probability, or truth, in the gentile mythology, where every thing is transformed, the man Jupiter, for instance, into a swan; then into a bull, last of all into a god? A more direct answer, however, admits the objection, in its full extent. All the personages, above mentioned, and others of the same family, were both dead and deified, before the reigns of Laomedon and Priam. These are the proofs,

1. SIR I. Newton, on the authority of Pythagoras, affirms that the sepulchre of Minos, the son of Jupiter,

D d

was

was seen in Crete in the year before Christ 964, or the 14th of Rehoboam. Marsham refers to the Scholiast on Callimachus, who testified, that the word MINOIS had by length of time been obliterated, and that JUPITER'S SEPULCHRE only was legible; whereas the inscription, when complete, had been, "THE TOMB OF MINOS, THE SON OF JUPITER." A remark of Epimenides, a poet coeval with Solon, arraigns the veracity of his countrymen, in a character rehearsed by an Apostle, Titus, i. 12: "The Cretans are always liars." Callimachus, a later poet, in the days of Pt. Philadelphus, repeated and exemplified the charge, in the very case now under examination. "The Cretans are always liars, because they pretended, that the tomb of Jupiter was with them; whereas they had only that of his son Minos, for Jupiter himself was immortal *." Whether that monument and inscription were in memory of Jupiter, or of Minos, the present argument is not invalidated, for either the one or the other, perhaps both, died before the overthrow of Troy, and neither was immortal.

2. EVEN after the hero-gods had been enrolled among the celestials, they were liable to a temporary degradation, and exile. Thus Vulcan for a work of piety, towards his mother Juno, was precipitated from the summit of Olympus to the island of Lemnos. But examples, still more apposite occur.

* See Callim. Hymnum i. in Jovem, v. 8.

JUPITER, having discharged a thunderbolt which slew Æsculapius, incurred the resentment of Apollo, who in revenge murdered one of the Cyclops, usually employed in forging the artillery of the clouds; and for that offence Apollo being excluded from heaven, betook himself to the humble occupation of a shepherd. About the same time, it seems, Neptune, (not thinking the empire of the sea, equal to that of earth and heaven, conspired with other deities to dethrone Jupiter), was condemned to assist Laomedon in repairing the walls of Troy. After a train of amorous adventures, Apollo became partner with Neptune in the engagement to rebuild the Trojan walls, on the reasonable condition, that the king should restore the ornaments and treasures, which had been expended in the fortifications. In one year the work was finished; but Laomedon having defrauded the divine architects, Apollo sent a destructive pestilence among his subjects; Neptune laid waste his territories by inundations; and Jupiter, resenting the perfidy, decreed irreversibly the ruin of the kingdom and capital *. These were works proper to deities.

3. THE Palladium, or curious statue of Minerva, which, according to the oracles of fiction, was let down from heaven, near the tent of Ilus, the 4th sovereign of Ilium, while that prince was rearing the citadel,

* These coincidences of events, personages, and times, indicate the particular period when Æsculapius, the son of Apollo, and god of medicine, flourished. Homer, (Iliad, iv. 193.) mentioning Machaon, the son of Æsculapius, among the heroes at Troy, confirms this arrangement.

evinces that the goddess had previously retired from the stage of mortality. Anciently deification was a ceremony not indulged to the living. It is mentioned as a circumstance without precedent, that divine honours were paid to some of the Cæsars before death.

3. *Objection.*

“THE Romans compute the chronology of their gods differently from the Greeks.” True; but the more recent nation assumes a less remote term. Both worshipped the same Jupiter, the son of Saturn, and sovereign of Crete. By the Greek reckoning he was coeval with the Phœnician Cadmus, and the Egyptian Danaus; and all three flourished in the late years of Samuel’s government: by the Roman, with David and Solomon. The fall of Troy has been fixed to the 78th year from the death of Solomon. Ovid introduces Ajax supporting his claim to the armour of Achilles by the consideration that he was the third in descent from Jupiter, who, by allowing three generations for a century, was a mortal king, and coeval with David. But if his reign were likewise co-existent with the rise of the Bœotian Thebes, in the days of Cadmus, he must have been dead long before the overthrow of Troy. In the fictitious theology of paganism, the actions of this and the other mortal heroes are often blended, in promiscuous confusion, with those of the immortal gods. In like manner the Greek chronology makes Venus, the mother of Hermione, coeval with Cadmus; and that of the Romans represents her as the mother
of

of Æneas. For this difference no reason can be assigned, except on the supposition, that distinct terms were assumed for the two computations.

Scheme of arrangement for the kings of Latium and Rome.

“ WHEN the Greeks and Latines were forming their Technical Chronology, great were the disputes about the antiquity of Rome. The Greeks made it much older than the Olympiads: some of them said it was built by Æneas; others by Romus, the son or grandson of Æneas; others by Romus, the son or grandson of Latinus, king of the Aborigines; others by Romus, the son of Ulysses, or of Ascanius, or of Italus: and some of the Latines at first fell in with the opinion of the Greeks, saying, that it was built by Romulus the son or grandson of Æneas. Timæus Siculus represented it built by Romulus, the grandson of Æneas, above 100 years before the Olympiads; and so did Nævius the poet, who was 20 years older than Ennius, and served in the first Punic war, the history of which he wrote. Hitherto nothing certain was agreed upon. But about 140, or 150, years after the death of Alexander the Great, they began to say, that Rome was built a second time by Romulus, in the 15th age after the destruction of Troy. By ages they meant the reigns of the Latine kings at Alba, and reckoned the first 14 at about 432 years*.”

* Chron. p. 128.

THIS historical enumeration of dates and opinions is abridged from **Dionysius of Halicarnassus** * ; whose testimony merits more credit, as a voucher of ancient traditions, than as an authentic record of facts. One infallible chronological character, the overthrow of **Troy**, Sir I. Newton has ascertained by a process of operations in reasoning, the result of which is equivalent to demonstration. The date discovered, A. M. 3108, derives confirmation from a multiplicity of coincident events, in the pedigrees of families, and the records of kingdoms, which not only enforce conviction, but reduce to an absurdity, every pretension to contradictory evidence.

By this test let the presumed date of the first Olympiad be tried. To the 18th of **Jehoshaphat**, A. M. 3108, add 432, the sum 3540, continues the reckoning to the 17th of **Xerxes**, king of Persia, or the 4th year of the 52d Olympiad, counted from the restoration of that epoch by **Iphitus**, A. M. 3232. Sir I. Newton, reprobating this arrangement as exorbitant, has recourse to an equation, which brings the last year of the Latine kings down to the 38th Olympiad.

By 14, the number of the kings, divide 432, the duration of their reigns, and the quotient, 31, will be the common measure nearly. This illustrious author, assigning but 20 years a-piece to each sovereign, reduces the total sum from 432 to 280. This equation is still exceptionable on the score of excess. For 3108+

* Lib. i. c. 71—75.

280=3388, prolong the computation to the 19th of Josiah; or the 3d of the 39th Olympiad. A much shorter term must be allowed for the 14 kings in Latium prior to Romulus. Our worthy Reformer of ancient chronology had two justifiable methods of adjusting history by the joint aid of generations and reigns:—He excluded such kings as had done nothing memorable, or seemed to fall under the class of Utopian princes, imaginary characters, inserted in national calendars, on purpose to amplify the accounts of time;—and abridged reigns apparently too long, or numerous, to accord with the course of nature. It fairly admits a query, whether many of the kings between Æneas and Romulus, were not Utopian?

IF from the date of the restored Olympiad, be deducted the year of Troy's downfall, (that is 3232—3108=124), the result of the operation is the astronomical interval; and why should historical arrangements be constructed, in contradiction to physical truth? In the passage above quoted immediately from Sir I. Newton on the authority of Dionysius the Halicarnassian, is recorded the testimony of several ancient writers, (prior in time to Alexander the Great), whose belief it was, that a grandson, or great grandson, of Æneas laid the foundation of Rome; whether Romulus and Remus were the founders, or either, is an indifferent circumstance. Sir Isaac has overlooked a remark of Dionysius, which is, "That Cephalon, a very ancient author, referred the building of Rome to the second generation after the Trojan war, by a colony who

escaped from Troy with Æneas; that its founder was Remus, the leader of the colony; that he was a son of Æneas, and that Romulus was one of four brothers by the same father. Demagoras, Agathyllus also, and many others, agree in the circumstance of time, and in the conductor of the expedition*. Dionysius adds many testimonies of Roman writers, who unanimously affirmed that a Trojan colony settled in Italy soon after the Trojan war; and that Rome was built after the second generation in the line from Æneas. An interval of 15 generations, Sir Isaac Newton admits, was never pretended till after the rise of the Greek Empire, six full centuries after the conflagration of Troy.

THE more ancient writers of all nations never incurred the censure of affecting an extravagant antiquity. Among the Jews, Moses was more moderate than Josephus; and the more ancient authors in Greece and Rome, than their successors. This consideration supports the not improbable conjecture, that the interval from the period of the Trojan war to the first Olympiad, has been protracted to a duration which no evidence can justify, or even credulity admit.

SUPPOSE, what Sir I. Newton will not allow, that the Varronian era was the third of the 6th Olympiad, or the 23d from the restoration of that chronological term, Rome began to be built 147 years after the fall of Troy. For $124 + 23 = 147$; and $3108 + 147 =$ A. M. 3255, coincident with the first year of Romulus,

* Rom. Ant'q. lib. i. c. 72.

and less by unity, than the first year of the Varronian reckoning, A. M. 3256.

THE Newtonian computation proceeds on the postulate, that the reigns both in Latium and Rome are to be reduced. But the latter clause of the postulate is inadmissible, because no scheme of historical arrangement can vindicate the propriety, or truth, of deferring the accession of Romulus, or the origin of his capital, to the 38th Olympiad. That great man might, without the least suspicion of violating physical probability, have retrenched the number of the Latian kings. By 14 divide 147, the result is 10 years 6 months each. These reigns are shorter by one half than Sir Isaac is willing, in other cases, to admit. At the rate of 5 reigns for a century, and proportionally for the residuary number, seven intermediate princes might exhaust the space from the fall of Troy to the rise of Rome, equivalent to about four generations of 33 years one with another.

THE date assigned in the *Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended*, for the subversion of Priam's capital, is in reality that fixed point, whence commences certainty in computation by the national eras of paganism; because the time of that catastrophe is defined, by a cluster of chronological notations, which bring into coincidence the history of the Hebrews, with that of the co-existing pagan establishments. Some of the more notable synchronisms, in the natural order, are, by way of recapitulation, subjoined.

I. JEHOSHAPHAT,

1. JEHOSHAPHAT, Ahab, and Ethbaal, were contemporary sovereigns in Jerusalem, Samaria, and Sidon ; for Ahab married Jezebel the daughter of Ethbaal, and Jehoshaphat's son, Jehoram, married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab.

2. TROY was laid in ashes in the reigns of the same Jehoshaphat and Ahab, as also in that of Agenor, Belus, or Matgenus, the grandson of Ethbaal.

3. NEW Salamis in Cyprus was founded seven years after the conflagration of Troy, by Teucer the son of Telamon, in whose family the sovereignty continued seven centuries, in that island.

4. ÆNEAS about the same time became the father of kings, in a new series, over Latium, prior to Romulus. This series contains 14 names, to whose reigns is assigned a period of 432 years, which Sir I. Newton reduces to 280 *. The annexed Table will perhaps evince, that even the less number exceeds the truth.

* Such is the diversity of names, that the number of sovereigns, and the order of succession, cannot easily be ascertained. Æneas the father of the colony, to whom Dionysius assigns a reign of 7 years from the fall of Troy, is excluded. This little addition makes the sum total 432, as in the next page. But the number of reigns thus enlarged, exceeds 14 by unity.

OVID.	EUSEBIUS.	LIVY.	DIONYSIUS.	
Ascanius	Ascanius	Æneas	Ascanius	38
Sylvius	Sylvius	Ascanius	Sylvius	29
	Æneas	Sylvius	Æneas	31
Latinus	Latinus	Latinus	Latinus	51
Alba	Alba	Alba	Albas	39
Epytus	Sylvius, Athis	Atis	Capetus	26
Capys	Capys	Capys	Capys	28
Capetus	Calpetus	Calpetus	Calpetus	13
Tiberinus	Tiberinus	Tiberinus	Tiberinus	8
Agrippa	Agrippa	Agrippa	Agrippas	41
Remulus	Remulus	Remulus	Allades	19
Aventinus	Aventinus	Aventinus	Aventinus	37
Proca	Procas	Proca	Procas	23
Numitor	Amulius	Amulius	Amulius	42
				<hr/> 425

IN these four editions the names, and order of succession, are too much at variance to acquire the credit due to authentic records. The numbers taken from Dionysius do not amount to 432. He assigns indeed 7 years to the first Æneas and his predecessor Latinus; which fill the blank. Proper, but inefficient, is Sir Isaac Newton's scheme for reducing the quantum of these reigns from 432 to 280 years, as it has been shewn, that the space, between Latinus and Romulus, cannot exceed 147 years. Absolutely necessary it is to retrench the one half of the nominal kings, that the arrangements

arrangements by generations and reigns may correspond to the national eras, by which the history of the times is to be adjusted.

5. DIDO the great grand-daughter of Ethbaal laid the foundation of Carthage in the 18th year from the defolation of Troy, as formerly mentioned, in coincidence with sundry chronological characters. As the history of this new state is incorporated with that of the Roman Empire, the time of its origin is an acquisition of no small importance.

6. A. M. 3232 IPHITUS restored the Greek Olympiad 124 years after the conclusion of the Trojan war, and 7 after the foundation of Carthage. It is not alleged that this year was distinguished by the exhibition of the usual solemnities, but that is affirmed to be the true source whence the first circulating period of four years, characterised as the original Olympiad, begins. One invariable criterion discriminates the years on which prizes were adjudged to the victors—they were BISSEXTILE. This appropriate and exclusive mark of the periodical quadriennium in Greece, is the more remarkable, as prior in time to the knowledge of the astronomical reason, which requires the intercalary day: for it is observed by Mr. Costard, “That the time is uncertain when it was discovered that the true length of the solar year was $365\frac{1}{4}$ days; but probably not much before the time of Eudoxus, that is, 363 years before our era:” or, 413 subsequent to the era of the restored Olympiad*. This noted term

* See COSTARD's *Astronomy of the Ancients*, 1746, p. 36.

of computation, Sir Isaac Newton admits, was called, by the Greeks, the source of HISTORICAL time. But he adds, "The fabulous ages wanted a good chronology, and so also did the historical for the first 60 or 70 Olympiads *."

If this postulate be implicitly admitted, the illustrious author's arrangement, which defers the foundation of Rome to the 38th Olympiad, is involved in all the uncertainty of the fabulous ages; nay, it may be doubted whether the first year of the 68th Olympiad were the true date of the Regifuge, as is asserted, without a peradventure †. Suppose the consulate introduced with the ensuing year, this important revolution is characterised by a very ambiguous point in time;—that imperceptible line which divides the historical from the fabulous ages.

7. IN the year of the world 3255 was the foundation of Rome laid, 147 from the fall of Troy, 130 from the rise of Carthage, and 23 from the revival of the Olympiad ‡. Sir I. Newton's rash and groundless hypothesis,

* Chron. p. 44.

† Chron. p. 130.

‡ Sir I. Newton says, that Varro computes the first of Rome from the first of the viith Olympiad, Chron. p. 129. This erroneous date is, without the least suspicion of fallacy, copied from Dionysius the Antiquary, lib. i. c. 72. In the 74th chapter of the same book he remarks, "Porcius Cato adopts no Grecian account, but being no less accurate in collecting ancient historical facts, than the very best writers, he connects the building of Rome with the 432d after the taking of Troy. This term, compared with the tables of Eratosthenes, coincides

hypothesis, which protracts the building of Rome to the 38th Olympiad, incurs the censure of an egregious metachronism. The word *protracted* is here fitly used, for certain it is, that the work was begun 130 years earlier. The Olympiad from its restoration did not immediately become a general term in reckoning, even among the Greeks. If the Romans, after several centuries, began to connect their own history with the chronology of the Olympiads, their notations, if supported by various probabilities of certainty, are not to be rejected, as of doubtful credit. On this foot, Eutropius; and others, who assign the third of the vith Olympiad for the historical origin of Rome, are not to be suspected of credulity or falsehood.

cides with the first of Olympiad vii. If Cato followed no Greek chronologer, he ventured to introduce a computation of his own. The first Varronian year of Rome did coincide in January A. P. J. 3961, with which month began A. U. C. 1; and the third year of the vith Olympiad expired about the time of the ensuing summer solstice. By the *Fasti Consulares* the fourth of the vith Olympiad is the first of Rome; and, by the Catonian era, this date is brought one year lower still. Unavoidable is the conclusion that Dionysius and Sir I. Newton fell into a mistake, when they affirmed the synchronism of the Varronian epoch, with the first of the viith Olympiad. With an obvious neglect of propriety, does the great antiquary connect the first year of Romulus with the third of the Varronian era.

FROM

FROM Dionysius * are collected the following apposite notations, expressing the dates of reigns.

REIGNS.	DATES.	AUTHORITIES.
Romulus	Olympiads 1	vii. Books and Chapp. i. 161.
Numa Pompilius	3	xvi. ii. 58.
Tullus Hostilius	2	xxvii. iii. 1.
Ancus Marcius	2	xxxv. iii. 37.
Tarquinius Priscus.	2	xli. iii. 47.
Servius Tullius	4	l. iv. 1.
Tarq. Superbus	4	lxi. iv. 41.
Brutus & Collatinus, the first pair	2	lxviii. of Consuls. v. 1.

THUS the reigns of the seven kings, from Romulus to the first pair of Consuls exclusively, amount to 244 years. The reasons, which militate against Sir I. Newton's reduction of them to 119, have already been set forth at large ; and if the objections, to the abbreviation of reigns, be satisfactory and insurmountable, no inducement occurs for bringing the date of the Varonian computation forward to the year before Christ 627, as in the SHORT CHRONICLE. The penetrating author seems to have been aware, that his scheme for bringing the overthrow of Troy almost 300 years lower than the general opinion, would not escape the rod of criticism. He therefore judged it proper not to incur the suspicion of compressing, at one bold opera-

* As Dionysius professedly adopts the Catonian reckoning, which brings the several dates two years lower than the Varonian, the accession of Romulus must be computed from the 3d of the viith Olympiad, the first consulate from the 4th of the lxviith, and each intermediate date carried two years higher.

tion,

tion, 432 years into 124. Much more plausible it was to extend an expedient of gradual retrenchment through 676 nominal years, comprehending 21 reigns, all which reigns it was judged advisable to retain, but to exclude 277 years, as incompatible with the course of nature in generations.

SUFFICE it to have mentioned, without an intent to amplify, certain instances of deviation from the truth of chronology, history, and nature, in detached parts of this extensive work. It must not, however, be dissembled, that certain decisions of this great master in computation, contradict assumed principles, and shake the foundation of pre-established discoveries.

WITH a felicity of uniting dispersed materials, (a talent almost peculiar to himself), Sir I. Newton found that Carthage was destroyed A. P. Jul. 4568 ;—that it had stood 737 years ;—that it had been built A. P. Jul. 3831. Easy it was to recollect that the year, when Carthage was overthrown, coincided with the 608th from the foundation of Rome : and that $4568 - 608 = 3960$, which operation continues the reckoning back to the first half of the third year in the 6th Olympiad, or the true source of the Varronian epoch. Thus Sir I. Newton's principles, fairly applied, invalidate his own decisions : for $3960 - 3831 = 129$, by which quantity Carthage was older than Rome. But if the foundation of the latter were laid after the lapse of 38 Olympiads, the difference in time is 260 years. Besides the incongruity of shifting terms, the age of Carthage being measured by the years of Rome, computed

computed from the 6th Olympiad, and then this foundation is removed, and the interval enlarged by one half, with respect to the date of the two cities, but diminished with respect to the term of co-existence. This mode of computation resembles some of the plausible fallacies in logic. Besides this obvious incongruity, another and greater perplexity occurs. The first Punic war broke out in the 188th consulate from the expulsion of the kings; A. Claudius Caudex, and M. Fulvius Flaccus, then holding the fasces. Sir Isaac allows but 119 years for the period of monarchy: and $188 + 119 = 307$, denotes the year of Rome according to the CHRONOLOGY of ancient Kingdoms amended, at the commencement of the first Punic war. By the same authority Carthage had stood 567 years. The very supposition that Rome, at so very early a period, was more than a match for Carthage, exhibits the aspect of something more than a historical paradox.

8. IN the 6th year from the Varronian Era, inclusively, began the famous computation called The Era of Nabonassar, on the partition of the Assyrian Empire by him and Tiglath-Pileser. Bishop Beveridge extols it, as a very accurate character of Times, and incapable of deception*.

AN account of its form, mechanism, and quantity, is incompatible with the narrow limits of this Appendix. As a term in computation it obtained a general and

* Hâc epochâ nihil in totâ chronologiâ celebrius, nihil cognitu magis necessarium, utpote qui exactissimus est temporum character, et fallere nescius. Instit. Chronol. lib. ii. cap. 16. 1.

almost exclusive reception, over Assyria, Chaldea, Egypt, Media, and Persia. With its first year Ptolemy began his very learned performance, the Mathematical Syntaxis, and Dean Prideaux his excellent Connexion of the Old and New Testament History with that of Paganism. It serves as an infallible directory for the chronology and history of the times, under the successive monarchies, during the lapse of nine centuries.

THAT very eminent author continues his valuable work down to the time of M. Antoninus, and, not without obvious propriety, concludes his researches, after having ascertained a sufficient number of fixed periods, which may be prolonged indefinitely in the progressive series of years and centuries, for conducting future adventurers through the thorny paths of chronological disquisition. Such has the writer of these sheets found them. The sanguine desire of improving the useful discoveries of his ingenious and learned predecessors, for facilitating progress in sacred literature, has prompted him to strike out, in many cases of difficult investigation, a new track for himself; cautious, on the one hand, of innovation, and on the other, of intemperate censure.

THE primary inducement to an enterprize so complicated and extensive, was the correction of those numbers, relative to family pedigrees and chronology, which, seemingly at mutual variance, incongruous with nature, or intuitively absurd, either mar the sense, or impair the credibility, of many such notations in the sacred volumes. For the attainment of an end so

desirable, recourse was had to various expedients, and to many without effect. As a series of genealogies, or intervals of lineal descent from a first ancestor, is the sole basis of the sacred chronology, during the long space of 25 centuries prior to the Exodus;—and, as the inspired writers were directed to number the intermediate generations from the creation to our era;—it seemed reasonable to conclude, that genealogy is an ingredient, essential to certainty in the computation of times, so remote.

WITHOUT a scheme of chronology framed according to the natural measures of time, and to instituted combinations of its integral parts, that accuracy in computation, which excludes the possibility of deception, is not attainable.

SUPPOSE a history constructed on such infallible principles, it must extend back to the primary source of measured time, otherwise that radical point, whence PROCREATION begins, cannot be ascertained.

THE Bible History alone mentions a BEGINNING of computation by natural days. These are combined into weeks; these into months, so denominated from periodical aspects of the moon; and months into years. Years are distinguished into lunar, luni-solar, solar-tropical, and sidereal. Whatever might have been the form or dimensions of the civil years, in diverse ages or climates, the solar-tropical of 365d. 5h. 48m. 57s. was the standard of computation among the Patriarchs, Hebrews, Israelites, and Jews. Hence it is collected that their computations were conformable to the natural

measures of time, in its various integral parts. Years too were combined into larger integral parts, of unequal quantity, called INTERVALS OR FIXED PERIODS, whence new terms in computation, each beginning with unity.

COMPUTATION derives additional certainty from the periodical solemnities of the Jewish worship, regulated by the phases of the moon, and adjusted to the apparently annual circuits of the sun.

By all these, and many other expedients, suggested from natural phenomena, in connexion with institutions civil and sacred, has it been attempted to define the number of days, weeks, lunations, solstices, equinoxes, and astronomical years, from the primeval week to that of our Lord's resurrection. From the vague, fictitious, and contradictory annals of paganism, impossible it is to solve a problem, for which operation the Bible alone affords sufficient principles. The past duration of the solar system is a discovery, derived solely from the books of Moses : and the ancient history of the pagan world must be adjusted to that standard, not the sacred history to the annals of the gentiles.

THOUGH unequivocal and decisive in this matter are the notations of times in the books of Moses and the Prophets, yet it is with truth affirmed, that such notations have not yet been generally understood, and judiciously applied. Foreign chronologers, such as Scaliger and Petau, mislook by many years the first point in historical time. Our revered countryman, Sir Isaac Newton, left this point unexamined. Bedford and

Kennedy

Kennedy rectified Usher's primary term in computation, but retained all his subsequent misarrangements.

IN the foregoing Analysis, the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch has been adopted as the model of computation prior to the birth of Abram, in the 130th year of his father Terah. To the critical annotations of Wall, Kennicott, Mill, Kuster, Wetstein, Bowyer, and others, the author acknowledges his obligations for various readings in the printed and manuscript copies of both Testaments, by which several numerical mistakes have been rectified. In some cases parallel texts, in others the course of nature, or historical connexion, have been admitted, as equivalent to the authority of approved various readings in particular texts or their versions, especially those of the earliest dates.

THE writer of these papers restricted his enquiries to those numbers alone, which he judged subservient to the elucidation of the Sacred Annals, with a reference to *chronology, genealogy, and history*. Few and inconsiderable are the proposed emendations, which rest on no better authority, than his own private conjecture.

THE texts where these emendations have been proposed, the numbers to be corrected, and the subjects to which they refer, are specified as below.

Rehoboam's age for	41	read	27	1 Kings	xiv.	20.
Amon's	22		42	2 Chron.	xxxiii.	21.
Josiah's	8		18		xxxiv.	1.
Zedekiah's	21		35		xxxvi.	11.
Jehoshaphat's reign	18		22	2 Kings	iii.	1.
Asa's	36		26	2 Chron.	xvi.	1.

THIS very diminutive sum of discordant numbers, in the pedigrees, and chronology of the whole Bible, does not exhibit so bulky and portentous a figure, as might be presumed, from the loud and frequent clamours of modern free-thinkers, who would not hesitate to apologize for errata far more numerous and important, in the puny volumes of Eutropius or Florus.

THESE strictures, on this great man's last bequest to the literary world, might have been extended to a much more minute specification of articles susceptible of improvement, or transcendently excellent. A small specimen of either kind was intended to be set before the public, with quite other views, than to disparage a character, every way respectable, and whose renown his own valuable works will transmit to a very remote posterity, with increasing honour.

SIR I. Newton's principles of computation are applicable to many more historical synchronisms, than are mentioned by himself, or can here be enumerated. Those who wish to see the subject prosecuted more diffusively, from the time of the Judges in Israel to the captivity of Zedekiah, may consult Dr. Winder's *History of Knowledge*, chiefly religious, 2 vols. 4to, 1746, a work now almost forgotten.

FROM the facts established in this chapter, natural is the inference, that the fall of Troy is the rise of the true historical era among the gentiles. For, in a very short time after, commenced four famous national eras as in the subjoined scheme of their dates.

Troy

Troy overthrown, A. P. J. 3813, coinci-	
dent with	A. M. 3108
New Salamis built by Teucer	7
Dido lays the foundation of Carthage	11
Source of computation by the Olympiads	106
First Varronian year of Rome	24
First year of Nabonassar's era	6
Sir Isaac Newton's chronology ends	416

A. P. J. 4383. A. M. 3678.

ONE general reflection, though obvious, is too important to be omitted. The arts of computation had made such progress in the pagan world, that the four principal fixed periods of gentilism commenced before the Annals of the Old Testament were concluded. These periods are called the artificial chronology. But the Greeks had calculated eclipses about the time of the 70 years captivity, which is the era of astronomical chronology. Before the close of the Hebrew canon 49 of the 490 prophetic years had elapsed, so that the remaining 341, ending with the crucifixion, run parallel with the corresponding years of the Olympiad, of Rome, of Nabonassar, and of the Seleucidæ. Such was the providential care of overruling Wisdom in appointing fit and efficient means for explaining the oracles of prophecy by the chronology and history of kingdoms.

C H A P. V.

FALCONER'S *Chronological Tables*.

WHILE this last sheet was under the compositor's hands, this publication was advertised for sale. Its professed design is to construct a chronological chain, uniting the common history with the sacred, from the demise of David to that of Alexander the Great, by the late Thomas Falconer of Chester Esq. The title prompted curiosity, and even impatience, to peruse the volume, so recently announced.

IN a PREFATORY DISCOURSE of 134 quarto pages, "are explained the principal columns in the *Tables*, which were intended to fill up the dark period between the *cessation* of the Jewish, and the *certainty* of the Greek history. Those on the left hand, representing the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, are regulated by the admirable system of A. B. Usher, but without following him implicitly year by year. The first column on the left hand is the Julian Period, which may be compared with that on the opposite side, denoting the years before the birth of our blessed Saviour, according to the vulgar era ; and the other column of numbers, adjoining on the right hand, to the chronicle of Israel,

is

is meant to prove the truth of Ezekiel's prediction of 390 years, and may serve as a register of time, from that noted epoch, the separation of the two kingdoms." Pref. p. 6. &c.

ON the plan and execution of this work, it is judged expedient to suggest a few cursory remarks.

I. USHER'S *admirable* system, assigning a false date both for the creation, and for the vulgar era, takes four historical years from the age of the world, and by the same quantity anticipates the true year of our Lord's birth. Thus the interval, which comprehends 4008 astronomical years, is reduced to 4000.

To give, if possible, the figure of scientific precision to a mutilation so violent, the Primate was obliged to retrench four years from the reigns between David and the 11th year of Zedekiah. Hence the chronology of the Annals, erroneous in the beginning, middle, and end, forfeits every claim to the character of an accurate and infallible directory, for the interval.

THE great Sir Isaac Newton, projecting a well proportioned and durable fabric, had not the precaution to clear away the rubbish of the old building, before he laid the new foundation. For this reason, certain imperfections, inherent in the composition of the ANNALS, are derived to the CHRONOLOGY of ancient Kingdoms AMENDED.

MR. Falconer, not suspecting fundamental oversights in the principles assumed by his predecessors, and eager to reach the conclusion of his work, transports his
readers,

readers, at once, into the very center of his subject,
like Homer in the very opening of his poem,

Semper ad eventum festinat ; & in MEDIAS RES
Non secus ac notas Auditorem rapit. — HOR.

But to the grand event he speeds his course,
And bears his readers with impetuous force,
Into the MIDST of THINGS. FRANCIS,

To ascertain the true date of Solomon's accession, it is necessary, that Usher's radical mistake, in connecting the first year of historical time with the number of the Julian Period 710, instead of 706, be rectified.

FROM the creation to the demise of David, the intermediate space is 2991 astronomical years, the last incomplete, at his death. Solomon's reign is therefore dated from the Hebrew month Nisan, A. M. 2991 ; to this sum add the antemundane numbers of the Julian Period, 705, and the first of Solomon coincides with A. P. J. 3696. In the 40th of his reign he died, and that year, as incomplete, is accounted the first of Rehoboam. From the 39th, therefore, of Solomon exclusively, are the 390 years of forbearance with the apostate tribes computed :

SOLOMON'S ACCESSION.

	World.	J. Per.	B. Chr.
Historical Arrangements	2991	3696	1017
Usher's Annals	2991	3701	1013
Falconer's Tables		3703	1011

OBVIOUS

OBVIOUS is the incongruity of Usher's notations for the number of the Julian Period, and the years before the vulgar era. Falconer does not follow him implicitly, year by year, and deviates so much farther from truth, by injudicious correction.

SOLOMON'S DEATH.

	World.	J. Per.	B. Chr.
Historical Arrangements	3031	3737	977
Usher's Annals	3029	3739	975
Falconer's Tables		3742	972

EXPIRATION OF THE 390 YEARS.

Historical Arrangements	3420	4125	588
Usher's Annals	3420	4130	584
Falconer's Tables		4132	582

THE true quantity of the interval from the 39th of Solomon, to the 11th of Zedekiah, excluding both, is a problem easy of solution. It is divided into three periods, as in the subjoined scheme.

1. Revolt of x Tribes.		2. The two thrones vacant.		3. Reduction of Samaria.	
Rehoboam	17	Athaliah	6	Hezekiah	23
Abijah	3	Jehoash	40	Manasseh	55
Afa	40	Amaziah	29	Amon	
Jehoshaphat	24	Uzziah	52	Josiah	31
Jehoram	8	Jotham	16	Jehoiakim	11
Ahaziah	1	Ahaz	16	Zedekiah	10
		Hezekiah	6		
	<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>
	93		165		132
	<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>

IN col. 1. the 41st of Afa, and 25th of Jehoshaphat are, as current, accounted severally the first of the subsequent

subsequent reigns. Thus are the 95 years of this first period reduced to 93 : and $93 + 165 + 132 = 390$, the last of this number ending some time in the fourth Hebrew month of the xth of Zedekiah. This prince was taken into custody, and transported one full year, after the ultimate term of the Divine patience with the offending house of Israel.

It has been noted, that Usher assigns but 4000 years from the creation to the true historical year of the Incarnation, and that this number is deficient by eight years. Of these 4 have been restored by transferring the date of the creation from the 710th to the 706th of the Julian Period. The Primate retrenches the 23d and 24th of Jehoshaphat, the 40th of Jehoash, and the 16th of Ahaz, not only without authority, but in direct contradiction to every criterion of historical truth. Thus are the 390 prophetic years either reduced to 386, or their expiration brought four years lower than their defined period. But be these four years restored to the reigns of Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, and Ahaz, then chronology will perfectly accord with history, the true year of our Lord's birth with A. M. 4004, and the Vulgar computation with 4008. Thus far concerning those arrangements, which affect the Sacred History alone. It remains to examine

2. THE synchronisms of the Sacred and Gentile History. In his advertisement Mr. Falconer notes, "Whether we adopt the extended calculations of Eratosthenes, or those more contracted by Sir I. Newton, the scripture history is equally distinct from the profane; and

and the taking of Troy, wherever it is placed, has no reference to the Jewish history, or any of the kingdoms connected with it."

THIS position is rather bold than just. If it be susceptible of a good meaning, penetration, in no common degree, is requisite to make the discovery. The Scripture History is *distinct* from the Profane, because the *records* of both are distinct. But if those records which contain an account of the kings in Judah and Israel suggest plain intimations of affinity with the royal family of Tyre, and of a famine in Israel and Phœnicia, in the reigns of the contemporary princes Ahab and Ethbaal, it seems strange to affirm, that the annals of Tyre have no reference to the Jewish history. Should it appear, from any record, not formally proved to be a counterfeit, that Troy was overthrown in the archonship of Menestheus, an Athenian magistrate, co-existent with Jehoshaphat in Judah, the man who would assert, that such an event had no reference to the history of the Jews or Athenians, might justly be suspected of sceptical infatuation.

FROM various, arbitrary and equivocal, positions of Herodotus, and other authorities, equally controvertible, this writer postulates, that Troy was demolished in the 12th of Rehoboam, which year he marks in parallelism with A. P. J. 3754, and before the vulgar era 960. These notations, however, indicate the 18th of that reign; or the 60th year prior to the 18th of Jehoshaphat. *That* arrangement has not the recommendation of one decisive synchronism; *this* of Sir I. Newton derives

derives confirmation, equal to the highest degree of moral certainty, from a train of circumstances in chronology, genealogy, and history, all superior to chance, collusion, or imposture.

If these remarks be just, with respect to co-existent characters and events, among jews and gentiles, while the former had national records, and a royal calendar; it can scarcely be presumed, that these CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES will afford light sufficient, through that dark period, from the overthrow of Jerusalem to the expedition of Xerxes.

ON the principles of the old artificial chronology, this prefatory discourse has considerable merit; but a system, constructed on precarious notions, and at variance with nature and science, can add nothing to the general stock of knowledge, in comparison of which mere erudition and learning avail little. Not altogether without utility are the Tables. For, engrossed on good clean paper, and a sizeable leaf, they may probably soon find their way to those aromatic repositories,

Where pepper, odors, frankincense, are sold.

——in vicum vendentem thus et odores,
Et piper, et quidquid chartis amicitur ineptis. HOR.

CONCLUSION.

C O N C L U S I O N.

IN the foregoing pages, frequent opportunities have occurred of doing justice to the ancient Jews, as faithful guardians of the divine oracles, and of vindicating them from the very improbable slander, raised against them by several primitive Fathers, and modern critics, as if they had wilfully, and with universal consent abridged the Mosaical chronology, one generation, or two, after their general dispersion.

IT is but equitable to add, that, ever from the time of that awful revolution, their descendants have uniformly disavowed, in principle and practice, all conformity with idolatrous rites, refrained from persecution, and abated in their zeal for making proselytes. In some of their convocations have they expressed their opinion, that the time for the appearance of the Messiah is past, and that, on account of their sins, their sanguine expectations have been frustrated.

ACCORDING to certain foreign gazettes, great numbers of the Jews in Italy have shewn, of late, a spirit of indifference to their religious usages, as inconvenient and unprofitable; and their Rabbies have convened a general Synod at Florence, the members being delegated from Modena, Man'ua, Rome, and other cities, where the Jews have schools.—After a conference of ten days, they have determined to reform their customs, in several

several particulars : and among others to prevent hindrance of business, the sabbath shall not be observed on Saturday, but on Sunday *.

THESE resolutions intimate political wisdom, and respect for the constitutions of Christendom. One principle maintained in the preceeding ANALYSIS, confirmed by the testimony of infallible history, and demonstrated by astronomical calculation, is the transferring of the sabbath from the viith to the 1st of the week at the Exodus: By that change, and the abrogation of the Mosaical sabbath, at the resurrection of Jesus, the first day of the Jewish and Christian week, became the viith, in the rotation of weeks from the beginning. By a partial conformity with the gospel, eminently subservient to their own secular interest, the modern Jews should not scruple to observe that day, which Adam, Noah, Abraham, and all the patriarchs before Moses, did account sacred to devotion and rest.

* See the London Newspapers for April 27th 1796.

F I N I S.

Additional corrections discovered after the operations of the Prefs.

P R E F A C E.

PAGE	L.	FOR	READ
viii.	15.	Lewis	Alexander.

P R O P O S A L S.

2.	26.	Loyd, Pearse,	Lloyd, Pearce.
3.	3.	Payley	Paley.
8.	14.	entrance into Canaan	Exodus.
11.	26.	2159	2169.
14.	9.	between	among.

A N A L Y S I S.

21.	10.	1758, 2463, 2250.	1759, 2264, 2249.
25.	12.	fourth	fifth.
112.	21.	vernal	autumnal.
115.	last.	expunge <i>Cassan</i>	
133.	15.	54	44.
144.	2.	} 710	750.
152.	22.		
184.	7.	15th in	15th of
198.	6.	3964	3963
312.	6.	mother	father.
328.	12.	1656	1756.
225.	2.	After years read, "at the time of Rehoboam's birth, and to abridge the duration both of his own life and reign."	